

Crisis in Education

Other Books by Dr. Bell

Beyond Agnosticism

Religion for Living

The Church in Disrepute

God Is Not Dead

A Man Can Live

Crisis in Education

A Challenge to American Complacency

BY BERNARD IDDINGS BELL

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

NEW YORK · LONDON · TORONTO

Crisis in Education

COPYRIGHT, 1949, BY BERNARD IDDINGS BELL

All rights in this book are reserved. It may not be used for dramatic, motion-, or talking-picture purposes without written authorization from the holder of these rights. Nor may the book or parts thereof be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without permission in writing, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information, address Whittlesey House, 330 West 42d Street, New York 18, New York.

FOURTH PRINTING

Printed in the United States of America

TO

Samuel Albert Nock

Preface

FOR over thirty years I have been engaged in education. I have taught at the grammar school level and at all levels up from that; I have been the president of a small college and a professor of a great university, a research student of education here and in Europe. I have read widely in the field of education, kept my eyes open, listened patiently, thought as clearly as my wits permitted. For the last seventeen of these years I have been increasingly sure how alarming is that which passes for education in twentieth-century America. From time to time I have said my say about certain aspects of the matter in *The Atlantic*, in *Harper's Magazine*, in the *American Scholar*, in *College and University*, in *The New York Times Magazine*, in *The Christian Century*, in *The Saturday Review of Literature*, in T S Eliot's lamented *Criterion*. I have lectured about education in universities, colleges, and normal schools, before teachers' associations and clubs and forums. It seems to me time to draw these various utterances together, to restate them in a more considered unity; hence this book.

The intention is to disturb a pseudopatriotic complacency; to recall with alarm the cultural childish-

ness revealed by current trends in journalism, by the radio, by our magazines of large circulation and by our best-selling books, by the substitution of purchased amusement for recreation actively pursued, by the caliber of our drama and cinema, by mass response to emotionalized propaganda, by advertising which appeals chiefly to greed or to vanity, by the patent decay in good manners, by the spread of divorce and other manifestations of parental irresponsibility—by all the various aspects of behavior which indicate to a dispassionate student of human affairs the incompetence of a people and the insecurity of a civilization; to ask to what extent our educational theory and practice are responsible for the unsatisfactory state of our life and culture.

I am too much of a realist to think that in details I am correct in all my analyses and prescriptions; however, if I did not believe that my fundamental diagnosis is correct, I should not let this volume go to press.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	vii
1 Is American Education Good?	1
2 Persistent Adolescence	12
3 Civilizing the Common Man's Children	25
4 The High School	36
5 Higher Education and Intelligence	56
6 The Home and Education	78
7 Experience and Education	101
8 A Child's Religion	127
9 Religion and Higher Education	148
10 Education and Stateism	178
11 First Steps in Reformation	200
<i>Index</i>	231

1. Is American Education Good?

Is THE United States today a nation composed chiefly of people who have not grown up, who think and act for the most part—and in a democracy the most part is the determining part—with the immaturity and emotional impulsiveness of adolescents? Many shrewd observers of the American scene, both abroad and here at home, are saying that this is indeed the case and that it is our educational system, defective in its understanding of man, which is largely responsible for our dangerous juvenility. I venture to add my voice to theirs.

Education is our largest American industry. Statistics furnished by the Department of Education in Washington show that there were in 1944 (the latest year in which statistics are accurate) 604,448 teachers employed in kindergarten and elementary schools, 324,190 teachers in secondary schools, and 155,000 teachers in colleges and universities. This makes 1,083,638 teachers in all. It is estimated that by 1948 this number had grown to approximately 1,200,000. The number of students engaged in *full-time* study in 1943-1944 was 28,262,248. It is estimated that there were at least 2,840,000 persons engaged in part-

time study—night courses, etc. Hence the grand total of individuals studying in schools and colleges in this country would seem to be in the neighborhood of 31,000,000. Pupils and students together number certainly as many as 32,250,000. Over one-fifth of the total population are “school people.” Of quantity of education we can boast, with justification for our boasting. But what of its results?

If the charge of immaturity can justly be brought against us Americans—and it is hard to deny its validity—some of us are moved to ask how we got that way and what, if anything, the nation can do, what individuals can help it to do, to insure a recovery. Peter Pan is a charming figure in fantasy; but a real community made up of little boys (and girls) who never cease to think and behave as children has nightmare possibilities. Something must be done. But what?

Obviously, nothing much can be expected in the way of growing up from most of the alleged adults who now comprise the majority of the electorate in America. Unless maturity arrives by the age of thirty or so, and those in control are well over that, it can come, if at all, only by miraculous intervention of the gods, intervention which seems too much to expect or ask. Our task is somehow to mature the rising generation; therein lies our hope. It is the basic contention of this book that this necessary job cannot be done by our character-molding institutions—the home, the Church, the school—unless these redis-

cover somehow that *democratic education must be not only democratic but also education.*

An increasing number of observers, some of them specialists in education and others just generally intelligent, have reluctantly become convinced that what is now being done in the schools and colleges, assisted by the churches and homes, far from being a corrective of the current immaturity, is one of the chief causes of it, and a potent source of social instability and human unhappiness. To say this is not to deny, not to disparage the magnificent work being done incidentally in and by our schools and colleges and universities and churches and homes. It is not for what they do that one must blame them but for what they leave undone. More than a few of us have begun to suspect that somehow we must rescue the American schools and colleges from those in them who are mis-handling boys and girls or else be content to watch a continued deterioration of that democratically ordered society of which our fathers dreamed and for which they sacrificed and of which we boast one to another and to the rest of the world.

Because of a growing distrust of the competency of current American education, especially our higher education, there are those of us who were more than a little alarmed when we heard of the provision by our government at the close of World War II which makes it possible for any veteran to go to a college, university, or professional school almost entirely at public cost. We had reason to feel none too sure of the

wisdom of this procedure. The standards of admission and of achievement at such institutions, with a few honorable exceptions, have for some time been so low, their regimens have been so stereotyped, their desire for growth in quantity rather than quality has been so great, their appetite for fees to supplement an ever-lessening income from endowment so voracious that it was, or at least it seemed to us doubters, a dreadful thing to expose a million or so veterans to their tender mercies. It might be that the GI's would think that they were going to get an education at public expense; it was a shame thus to delude them.

The effect on the universities and colleges might be equally sad. Their financial hides saved, at least for the time being, these institutions of somewhat diluted learning would probably go in more and more for uncritical expansion. They would have to engage more professors, instructors, assistants, technicians than the competently trained supply; for lack of manpower the teaching would have to be done in mass lots by the discredited lecture method; there could be little analysis of individual students or guidance of them into the particular pursuits in which they were competent to function.

We were aware, to be sure, that the proposed grants would be useful in keeping out of the labor market a group too great easily to be assimilated into industry and agriculture—that this was probably the real motive of the GI Bill of Rights. We comforted ourselves also by remembering that most of the GI's

would be after only a few tools to use for the *improvement* of their financial status. We were fairly sure that the returning veterans were too much the product of our school system to know a decent educational discipline if they met up with it.

But what of the few who did wish an education and were competent to get one? And what of the harm that would be done to our country by throwing vast new crowds of conformist mediocrities with college degrees into a citizenry already overblessed with such people? No good and much almost certain harm would come to America by encouraging in complacency new throngs whose attention had been directed under official sanction chiefly to concentration on superficialities.*

What we dreaded seems to a large extent to be happening. Most of the collegiate GI's neither desire nor gain access to illumination or general understanding, while increasingly the cry goes up from the intelligent GI that instead of wisdom he is being sold an inferior piece of goods.

We comforted ourselves with the thought that the supply of veterans would soon be exhausted and that the evils involved in the GI Bill of Rights would

* "Today our best plans miscarry because they are in the hands of people who have undergone no inner growth. Most of these people have shrunk from facing the world crisis, and they have no notion of the manner in which they themselves have helped to bring it about. Their hidden prejudices, their glib hopes, their archaic desires and automatisms, usually couched in the language of assertive modernity . . ." Lewis Mumford, *The Condition of Man*, Harcourt, Brace and Company Inc., New York, 1944

come to an end. But now comes along the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (1948) * which, in spite of many valuable suggestions for improvement in education, advocates a vast extension of the privilege of getting a higher education at public expense, regardless of whether or not there is made available for this new academic population the sort of colleges which can develop their variant types of brains.†

* The Commission's Report was first published, in six parts, by the Government Printing Office, Washington, under the general title *Higher Education for American Democracy*. In 1948 Harper & Brothers published it in one volume. Despite a good initial press, it has not been received with universal acclaim. More than a few readers have found that they agree with the typically outspoken opinion of Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago the opening words of which are "The Report reflects the educational system with which it deals. It is big and booming. It is confused, confusing, and contradictory. It has something for everybody. It is generous, ignoble, bold, timid, naive, and optimistic. It is filled with the spirit of universal brotherhood and the sense of American superiority. It has great faith in money. It has great faith in courses. It is anti-humanistic and anti-intellectual. It is confident that vices can be turned into virtues by making them larger . . . Every cliché and every slogan of contemporary educational discussion appears once more . . . The cry is 'more' more money, more buildings, more professors, more students, more everything. The educational system is taken as given. It may be wasteful and shoddy. But let us expand it, even if that means that it will be more wasteful and shoddier, and all will be well." *The Educational Record*, April 1948, p. 113.

† "Now we have the President's Commission on Higher Education suggesting a vast expansion in education . . . To get that expansion they are willing to eliminate verbal skills and intellectual interests from the curriculum for many. If the President's Commission wishes to entertain a large segment of our population for four years at public expense, let them compare their thinking to that of Rome in the days of bread and circuses for the people, but let us be honest about it and not call it education." *Chemical and Engineering News*, Feb. 16, 1948, Vol. 26, p. 449.

In the minds of Congress and of our people generally, back of the GI Bill of Rights and back of these new proposals is an assumption that it is a good thing for everyone to attend the American college "as is," just as it has come to be taken as beyond argument that it is highly desirable for the national welfare that every child shall go through the American high school "as is." There are those of us who insist that these assumptions are unjustified, who maintain that what is needed is a rethinking of our whole notion of democratic education—differentiation in colleges, various kinds of high schools, widely variant types of post-high-school study, such education as will not stereotype on a low level every man Jack and woman Jill in the land but will rather, to use G. K. Chesterton's phrase, encourage "every potty little person to be happily and effectively his potty little self," such an educational system as will demand a clear willingness to work hard plus a demonstrated ability as prerequisites for access to the public funds. If this, our conviction, be un-American and unpatriotic, make the most of it.

Lest there be misunderstanding, it needs to be made clear that those of us who are doubters and viewers with alarm are not enamored of the little red schoolhouse or McGuffey's Readers or regimented classrooms or the use on pupils of the birch or the bamboo wand. We do not advocate a blind return to the educational methods of the nineteenth century—or of the thirteenth or of the fifth or of Periclean

Athens. But it is no mark of wisdom either, so we think, to admire educational philosophies, programs, methods merely because their proponents insist that they are "modern" or "progressive."

Sometimes "modern" and "progressive" educators go on to say that what they advocate is "scientific" and therefore to be accepted without question. Much as one respects the good faith of those who make this claim, it is hard to see that it is justified. John Dewey and his disciples, whatever be their wisdom or lack of it, do not come to their conclusions as a result of experimentation one whit more than do, for example, the Jesuits, who are at the opposite pole in method. In both cases what is advocated and practiced is derived from philosophical presupposition; it is deductive rather than inductive. We have yet to look upon a "scientific" pedagogy. Probably none is possible, at least in the sense of its being derived from measurement; human behavior is a bit too elusive for that.* If by "scientific" is meant testing theoretical presuppositions by how they work, then *all* schools of thought in education are scientific. "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is an observation of the fruits which scares many of us; we see what has hap-

* One of the most effective opponents of the prescription of educational objectives on a scientific basis is Boyd H. Bode. John S. Brubacher of Yale briefs Bode's argument as follows: "Science, Bode claimed, was not equipped to determine educational aims. Science could determine as a matter of fact what children and adults in society desired, but it could not, be stoutly maintained, determine what they ought to desire. It could determine desire but not desirability." *A History of the Problems of Education*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1947.

penea and is nappening to the American mind, the American character, under the leadership of those who now set the educational pattern. A theory which works so badly *must* be wrong.

And anyway, who that has common sense can regard modernity as a sure index of worth? Total war, for instance, is strictly modern, especially atomic war; but this does not lessen its deadly threat to human continuance. Mass production is modern; but its results are of mixed merit, to say the least.

Nor is being "progressive" inevitably virtuous or always shrewd. Sometimes progress is toward death. The mammoths of old time progressed. From century to century they became ever bigger and better armored. It was this progress that led to their extinction. They progressed until they could no longer handle themselves quickly, readily; and then a lot of funny little creatures, our semihuman ancestors, put the big brutes out of existence forever. More recently, we all have known of cities which prided themselves on "progress," meaning thereby growth in population, with no understanding that the price of their numerical development was the deterioration of charming and urbane communities into ugly, unorganized, uncivilized conglomerates of human insects living without dignity. Theirs was a progress in degeneration.

A *good* progress is progress toward fulfillment of purpose. The progress of an institution, to be admirable, must be toward a more adequate realization of

that institution's reason for being. Man decently develops only into a more purposeful manhood. If in alleged progress man goes off the rails and tears up the countryside instead of getting on to wherever man is supposed to go, he needs to be set firmly back on the tracks again, even if those who do it are called "reactionaries" for their pains or even, horrid word, "obscurantists."

We who have doubts of the competency of our schools and colleges and universities, our churches and homes, are all for a better education, all for an education more competently devised to do what an education is supposed to do; but we feel sure that much which today calls itself "education" is not only inadequate but has gotten clean away, in important and determining particulars, from doing what it is supposed to do. We believe, in short, that America is progressing toward uneducation, toward the prevention of education, toward injury to growing human beings, toward grave danger to cultural stability.

Nor would I have my readers think that when I speak of the iniquities of current American education I have in mind some small group of particularly daring innovators. I am persuaded that the extremists in this field have been only trumpeters preceding a great procession of educators, almost all of whom have been only too eager to go in the wrong direction. The extremists have not been leading this procession; they have, rather, themselves been forced along by the

pressure of the crowd. The extremists have been at the worst wrong only a little more emphatically than those whom they have called conservatives; all that they have been doing is to cry, "Please push harder, run faster." The proper indictment is not of the extremists but of current American education as a whole.

2. Persistent Adolescence

THE late Albert Jay Nock used to remark that the most acute observers of the cultural pattern in America have been not social scientists, educators, clergymen, jurists, philosophers, but humorists. A strong case may be made out for this opinion. One can gain a good deal of pertinent information not to be found elsewhere about eighteenth-century New England from perusing the *Johnnycake Papers* and about colonial New York from Irving's *Knickerbocker's History*. The Civil War period and what preceded and immediately followed it are illuminated by the comment of James Russell Lowell or even more by that of Artemus Ward. For the true significance of the 1870's and 1880's one should not omit a careful reading of Mark Twain. The turn of the century is most cannily interpreted by George Ade, by Bert Leston Taylor, most of all by Finley Peter Dunne, who for many years spilled a weekly column of pungent social analysis from the lips of Mr. Dooley, philosopher of Archey Road. The Age of Normalcy is revealed by the gentle irony of Booth Tarkington.

In our day we can add another name to this honorable roll of jesters sufficiently percipient to illuminate

the passing scene. Like his predecessors, this wag is looked on by contemporaries as little more than a designer of drolleries; posterity may deem him more significant, as it gains from his works a key to the understanding of that bewildering generation of Americans which lived and moved and, for the most part, made a mess of things in the 1940's. His name is Clifford Goldsmith. He writes a program called *The Aldrich Family*, and for years he has delighted a large and applauding weekly radio public.*

His Henry Aldrich is a teen-age lad, presented as "the typical American boy." Henry is almost indecently adolescent. Even Penrod seems sophisticated beside him. Henry is undisciplined, self-assertive, bewildered by life. He is the victim of a high school which underestimates him. He has acquired no facility for arriving at judgments social or artistic and he is apparently without religion of any kind. His time is spent chiefly in futile, pathetic, and undeniably laughable misadventures in the art of living. He is the creature of circumstance and moved about like a pawn by crowd opinion; his chief endeavor is to find out what are the mores and then to obey them; he is afraid above all things to think for himself, to go against convention or in any way to criticize it. What a different boy this is from Tom Sawyer or Huck Finn! His sister Mary is his feminine counterpart, so

* I hope no one will think I do not like the Aldrich program. It is vastly better than most of the radio programs. The point is that the program scares me, my observation over many years leads me to believe that the cartoon is not a caricature.

without purpose and so truculent as to make Miss Alcott's Meg, Jo, Beth, and Amy seem by comparison vital girls, daring, creative, vastly desirable to have about the house.

More tragicomic still are the father and mother of this pair. Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich are as conformist as Henry and Mary, as given to clichés, as vague in self-direction, as incompetent to discriminate, as essentially irreligious. They too are adolescents, middle-aged adolescents, not children any more but unable to grow up.

If these Aldriches are the representative American family they are recognized to be by the multitudes who listen in to their weekly exhibition of incompetency in living—and there is small reason to doubt it—only a miracle can save America from debacle. Such people are unequipped to create or to manage an effective nation, as unable to do that as they are to run their individual lives and face the challenges of home and neighborhood. Politically, they are easy dupes of any plausible demagogue who comes along with a slogan and a hillbilly band or its urban equivalent. They are not free men and women but base mechanicals. These four people and their neighbors are at once the products and the patrons of mass management, of a functionalized social structure, of a standardized press and radio, of slick magazines and book clubs, of an overly vocationalized education, of pressure salesmanship. The glass held up by Mr. Goldsmith is a mirror in which we can see in epitome

the America which once bred and reared daring dreamers, imaginative lovers, creative nonconformists, citizens who grew up, now become a homeland of persistent adolescents.

A discerning man, this Clifford Goldsmith! One may hope that transcripts of his broadcasts are being preserved for posterity in the Library of Congress; in the twenty-second century the social historian will find them valuable. They will help to explain why it was that, back in the middle 1900's, the most powerful nation on earth was also the most fumbling and ineffective. They will make for compassionate understanding that Americans of our time had lived so long in adolescent terms that, when they were called upon for leadership in a world crisis which demanded mature and wise decisions, they proved incompetent to make those decisions and to implement them.

Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich are too untrained in the art of thinking to understand the cause of the world's present misery and of the unanticipated fumbling of their own country in the postwar handling of its problems, foreign and domestic. They cannot understand why, in spite of material advantages beyond the dreams of man in former ages, they remain somehow so unhappy, so insecure, so restless. They are not what they are by intention. They are counters moved about by social forces which either blindly operate or are venally manipulated. They are what they are because no one has encouraged them, much less helped them, to bring their native intelligence

(which is considerable) to bear upon the problem of ends and means in their own lives, in the life of the nation, in the life of the world in which America must be a necessary cooperator.

The churches to which the Aldriches sometimes go, though not with regularity, and from which instruction and example in mature living might be expected, have gone in more and more for sociability, sentimentality, ceremonial without significance, unctuous utterance of pseudoethical trivialities. The schools have taught them to cheer, and if need be die for, "my country, right or wrong," and that it is man's primary duty to get on in the world and keep up with the Joneses.

Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich are not too greatly to be blamed for their rudimentary moral judgments; they are to be pitied and, if possible, rescued. They do at least begin to know that the world is all adrift. It may be, if we set ourselves to the task, that we can convince them it is they themselves who have slipped the moorings. But who is at work on this salvage?

It might be well to take a brief look at the ends which are in fact being aimed at in this country. There are four of these; they are the same life objectives which inexperienced adolescents usually think supremely worth while. Two of them—the quest for money and the quest for pleasure—are the goals which increasingly, for a half century at least, have determined the cultural pattern of America. The other two—the quest for power and the quest for

erudition—are equally inadequate, but to the pursuit of them more than a few are already turning as they find themselves increasingly bored by what has become the American way of life.

The Aldrichian civilization has been based largely on the assumption that the great, significant, happy man is the one who has been able to acquire a superabundance of possessions, who lives in a house or flat larger and more ornate than he and his family need for reasonable comfort; who has a motorcar without good reason, or two of them when only one is needed, or three or four when two would do; who has more clothes than he can wear out and a wife who dresses with conspicuous expensiveness; who has everything his heart desires and money can buy, and cash in the bank wherewith to purchase more of the same. How great a triumph to lift oneself to such a state of being! Since this is assumed to be the target at which an individual should aim, it follows that this is the social goal toward which national policies must be directed. A rich America is a great America!

Such a concept of nobility may appeal, usually does appeal, to the verdant adolescent, but it looks more than a little absurd in the light of mature experience. One meets many a man who has great wealth and yet is manifestly worth nothing. One meets other men who are as rich as these pitiable fellows but who are worth so much that when one thinks of them one pays them the compliment of forgetting their money altogether. One comes to know women so simple, so good,

so lovable as to be indispensable to all who meet them but who have never had a penny, have not now, never will have.

A study of history backs up one's experience. Those who in any generation have risen above the ruck of humanity to places of honor as great human beings have almost never had money. There have been a few rich people who are remembered, but examination of their records shows that they are significant not because of their wealth but much more often in spite of it. Not a single outstanding teacher of moral wisdom has failed to warn that riches tend to isolate their owners, make them petty, vulnerable, a little ridiculous.

Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich may have a faint memory of having heard something of this sort of thing when they were children; Henry and Mary have probably never had it called to their attention. Certainly the family is not likely to be reminded of it by contemporary books or magazines or newspapers, by the radio or the movies, by the billboards, by popular conversation, by the schools. Even when they go to church, which is rarely, they seldom get a hint in the sermons they hear that for the country, for their family, for themselves individually abundance is far more dangerous than poverty. They go their teen-age way, admiring the rich man, aiming to become rich themselves, sure that with wealth comes happiness, certain that for America to fulfill its destiny it is necessary

above all else that our physical standard of existence shall be lifted to ever more exalted heights.

It is likely to seem to Americans even more obvious, indeed unquestionable, that the great, significant, happy human being is the one who can have the best time, who can the most competently find amusement. When the usual American is charged with having a greedy, grasping soul he indignantly denies it—and with some justice, for he is concerned not so much with wealth as with what may be purchased therewith, a life full of entertainment. He is willing to spend money for fun. He buys books by the hundreds of thousands and magazines by the millions, and some of them he even reads, but mostly for distraction. He prefers either who-done-its or eroticism. He sits rapt while on the screen are unfolded before his eyes the adventures of glamorous women and two-fisted men. He pays high prices for seats in the stadium to applaud the gladiators. He buys hard liquor by the case. No man, he thinks, can with justice call him penny-pinching. What more can be asked for in the way of munificence than such prodigal expenditure for purchasable joys?

But pleasure palls; the time soon comes when no matter how much of it one possesses, or how exciting, it no longer entertains, no longer distracts from an essential tragedy. A playboy of twenty may be fun to gaze upon, even when we are moved to disapproval; but Heaven deliver us from having to look upon,

much worse to be, playboys of forty-five. How hard they work at enjoying themselves and how little they get—and less and less—in return for their labor! The last stage in a search for entertainment as the *sum-mum bonum* is that sense of being “fed up” which characterizes most Americans of middle age and older. They are restless, without inner security.

When men or nations get tired of dodging fundamental questions in a multitude of distractions, they turn to a search for something else that will, so they suppose, give them the sense of significance which they know they lack. This does not necessarily mean, however, that in sophistication they learn wisdom. If they remain adolescent in their approach to life they are frequently tempted to seek meaning for themselves and for their nation in terms of coercive power. They develop a Messianic complex. They seek to live other people's lives for them, ostensibly for the good of those other people but really in the hope of fulfilling themselves. They set out to attain greatness by imposing their supposedly superior understanding upon some man or nation who is less perceptive.

Precisely to the degree that Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich, and even more their children, get fed up with their senseless accumulation of goods and wearisome round of purchased amusements, they tend to become easy victims of the quite mad belief that America, which is themselves writ large, is called upon to impose its cultural pattern upon the lesser breeds without the Law. It is America which must solve the world-wide Jewish

problem, and in so doing cover up its own failures to reconcile creeds and colors. It is America which must teach Europe and Asia how to govern themselves, and in so doing forget the gross misgovernment in Memphis and Chicago and Jersey City and a thousand other boss-ridden communities, as well as an inability to face necessary issues that results from a two-party system in which neither party has unity of conviction and between which there almost never are clear-cut issues. We who cannot solve our own riddles must decide the issues facing humanity at large. We whose hearts are restless with discontent must bring peace to the world. And woe be to the cynic who doubts our competence to act in this grand manner!

Who that turns a trained eye on the current scene in America can fail to perceive how increasingly ready our people are to take refuge from the ignobility of greed and the boredom of pleasure in the pursuit of power, disguised as fulfillment of a romantic destiny but in reality the escapist device of a disappointed folk?

Less socially significant because only a few are competent to follow it, but nevertheless deleterious, is the way of those among us who seek to arrive at significance by pursuing erudition for its own sake, pure scholarship, learning divorced from life. Nothing is more sterile. In our institutions of higher learning one finds with the passing years more and more departmentalized pedants hiding in the holes of research, seeking to run away from embarrassing ques-

tions, afraid of philosophy, scared to death of religion. It involves no disparagement of contemporary scholarship, no lack of affection for scholars as such, to recognize that many of them go in for learning as an escape device useful only if one is to avoid facing what life is all about.

There is no real danger here for Henry and Mary (they seem to be too stupid even for the pursuit of pedantry), but there is danger for a number of their young friends, who are moved to seek significance by this sort of intellectual evasion.

Americans need to be rescued from teen-age pursuit of riches, comforts, amusements, pedantic preciosity, bragging strut. There is something vastly better to live for than these, as mature peoples have always known.

Man exists to do creatively, in the most craftsman-like manner possible, all things that must be done: great things like government, or mothering, or the healing of minds and bodies; small things like making beds, or hoeing corn, or driving a truck; things in the public eye like making speeches, or unleashing atomic energy, or making peace; obscure things like selling groceries, or running a bus, or teaching school. He finds inner peace who works at whatever is in front of him, not for the pay he gets or for what he can buy with that pay, not for applause or gratitude, but for sheer joy in creativity. There are a vast number of tasks to be performed in this world, most of them not romantic. They may be done in one of two ways:

just to get them over with as quickly and as painlessly as possible, in which case they become a monotonous burden hard to bear; or each as beautifully and thoroughly as possible, in which case life is good to the taste.

Our fathers knew the joy that lies in craftsmanship. They did not advocate it; they took it for granted. We have forgotten it, overlooked it. Craftsmanship is no longer practiced, taught, or praised. It is less and less possible to get, for love or money, anyone willing to do an honest job of work. That is why we are restless, unreliable, combative, caught in a web of doubt and dismay. No salmagundi made of things, amusements, lust for power can assuage the gnawing hunger to create. There will be no recovery of serenity, no mutual patience sufficient for fraternity, until we learn ourselves and teach our boys and girls that unless human beings become creative artists they remain petulant children, dangerous, predatory.

Our fathers also knew, but few of their progeny seem aware of it, that every man is made—and this is the highest art of all—to give to other men understanding, tolerance, clemency, not with design to get from those others any *quid pro quo*, not even to get from them understanding or clemency or tolerance, but just because this is the kind of thing that man can do and must, most humbly. Man was made to be a lover—not necessarily beloved but a lover. To be artist and lover, that is the destined end of man.

If Mr. and Mrs. Aldrich and Henry and Mary can-

not be persuaded of the truth of this, which the moralists and the religions all teach and to know which is the mark of maturity, if they persist in adolescence, are those of us who *are* adult tamely to acquiesce and conform? Have we indeed sunk to that most juvenile form of juvenility, the juvenility of grown-up people afraid to smack the children down when they seek to ride roughshod over parents and teachers? We dare not abdicate and make of these United States an autonomous nursery. If we do, we abandon our country to an infantilism which causes us to cruise rudderless in a stormy sea where judgment and sureness are required if we would avoid shipwreck.

In spite of the public-school system and an over-vocationalized higher education, in spite of churches singing nursery rhymes instead of chanting credos, in spite of Hollywood and the radio chains and the newspapers, in spite of everything, it is still possible that the Aldriches—perhaps not Mr. and Mrs., who are pretty far gone in fatuity, but Henry and Mary and their friends—may grow up. That will happen only if those who *have* grown up have courage and a clear, strong voice.

3. Civilizing

The Common Man's Children

IT HAS been truly said that this is the Century of the Common Man. The dictum is not, however, in the opinion of a good many objective and dispassionate observers of the cultural picture, as inevitable in implication of good as some who use the phrase seem to suppose. It does not follow that, because the Common Man has suddenly been lifted into control, he has thereby automatically been made competent to exert that control.

Until lately the Common Man has been the servant of the Gentleman. It is, alas, true that the Gentleman has often exploited the Common Man (whom he was called upon to take care of); but it has also been true, by and large, that the Gentleman has been somewhat prepared to take charge of things by undergoing an educational discipline in matters prerequisite to human welfare. The thing that has marked the Gentleman off from the Common Man has not been that the former has been wealthy and the latter poor in respect to wordly goods, for frequently the Gentleman has been anything but rich, but rather that the Gentleman has had and the Common Man has lacked what was commonly and correctly called a "liberal

education," an education which fitted him as a Free, or Liberal, Man to discriminate values and to direct his life toward reasoned and reasonable ends. Sometimes this liberal education was handed out on a silver platter, as in the case of Mr. Jefferson and the Adams family, and sometimes it was gained against heroic odds, as in the case of Mr. Lincoln.

The Gentleman did not govern perfectly—he was human—but on the whole he exercised control with a considerable knowledge of what was involved, for him and for the commonalty, in being human. He knew this because he had learned it from studying the long experiment of the race. Meanwhile the Common Man, chiefly because of sheer economic necessity, received little more than servile training, *i.e.*, training in technology.

Thanks to the power machine and its enriching consequences, the servant became almost overnight not the equal in social authority of his former master but, by sheer weight of numbers and votes, his superior. When the Common Man was thus suddenly emancipated, what he needed, if he was to meet his new responsibilities, was an education which would enable him to understand that which hitherto only the controlling few had been encouraged to try to understand: namely, the nobler and wiser aims of the race, those visions of human greatness and possible human significance that dictate the ethical foundations of a sound society. To have given the Common Man facility in such matters would have been truly "democratic

education." It would have lifted him into the stature of the Free Man, the Citizen Man, the Liberal Man. It would have bestowed on him an intellectual and spiritual emancipation comparable to his economic emancipation.

Instead of this the people who were supposedly the custodians of racial wisdom, those who handled education, said in effect to the newly powerful Common Man, "You are now the equal of Liberal Man, not only in authority but in understanding. You have next to nothing new to learn. What you are, is enough. All that you need is for us to help you become more productive technicians, more efficient artisans. As far as we can we shall see to it that all the Gentleman's sons, too, are forced to become your fellow artisans. All are to become slaves to process, slaves to method, slaves to things. The specially trained shall lead you no more. You shall lead yourselves and all other men, having never learned the wisdom necessary for leadership."

This ridiculous thing, this unjust and monstrous thing, is what we have done to the Common Man. Ours is the Century of the uneducated Common Man, of the Common Man unskilled in the art of living. Untaught in the wisdom of the race, he is competent neither to rule nor to be ruled. He is blatantly vulgar, ill-mannered, boorish, unsure of himself, pathetically hungry for happiness but unable to arrive at much of any happiness, not a man so much as a boy who has outgrown his britches.

In 1930 Ortega y Gasset gave us *The Revolt of the Masses*,* one of the books written in this century which must be read by everyone who would understand contemporary cultural development. Those who read it when it appeared have been saved a good deal of disillusionment. In it the Common Man as we know him today is called "the Vertical Intruder," the barbarian who has invaded civilization from the basement and has proceeded to play havoc with the salon. If only when he broke through we had said, "Welcome! Now you are here, we shall teach you not merely to own the place but also how to get the most out of living in it. Instead of that, we turned the house over to him without introducing him to the amenities of the drawing room and encouraged the poor devil to muck around in it without having learned how to enjoy it. Other observers have said the same, e.g., Berdyaev: "The irruption of the masses is the irruption of vast numbers of people in whom personality is not expressed and with whom is no qualitative definition but who possess great excitability and psychological readiness for slavery. This creates a crisis in civilization." †

Society has thus played the Common Man a low trick, for which those who control education are chiefly chargeable. Our schoolmen have obediently

* Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses*, W W Norton & Company, Inc., New York, 1932

† Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1944.

vulgarized their institutions by way of pseudodemocratic subterfuge. They have failed to insist that they love the Common Man enough not to deprive him of his newly won birthright, not to buy it from him with a mess of servile pottage.

Well, we are where we are politically. The Gentleman no longer governs. The Masses do not govern either; they have not been taught how to govern or even to look upon government as more than a dispenser of lollipops and toy balloons. But there must always be government and governors. Therefore, to fill the vacuum created by the demise of the Gentleman ruler, along has come the demagogue with slogans, sophisticated rhetoric, parades, pseudopatriotic bombast, ridiculous promises of much for nothing, skilled and unprincipled propaganda.

We have had Hitler's hullabaloo and Mussolini's and Stalin's, all applauded by the credulous common people. Nearer home, we have had the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations *cum* veto. Neither of these devices, designed to quiet the idealistic crowds while their authors went in for power politics, would have fooled the ruling classes of former days for a moment. They would not have fooled the Common Man of today if we had bothered to educate him instead of merely train him technically. They and their European equivalents have been clamorously approved by the mistaught multitudes, who, having tossed their dry-cleaned, mass-produced nightcaps in

the air to the political profit of the shrewd, now sit sorrowing as they await the advent of new Caesars for whom to cheer and die.

Nor is it those disciplined to do so who determine any more the standard of performance in the arts. These are controlled by the profit-hungry manipulators of a populace which has not been educated to arrive at judgment about beauty. Our ears are deafened and our eyes insulted by monstrous ugliness, mass-created and mass-distributed, by neon-lighted signs, by book clubs, by pulp magazines, by the programs and commercials on the radio, by that prostitution of the drama which hails from Hollywood.

Precisely to the extent that they believe in democracy those who have to do with educational policy making and administration must, for the good of society and for their own honor, rescue the Common Man from overabsorption in the servile crafts. They must help him to try to become the Gentleman which potentially he is but which actually he most certainly is not. Otherwise, with relentless inevitability, the Century of the Common Man will end in a worse enslavement of the Common Man than any he has ever known before, enslavement to a standardized vulgarity sold as the good life by those bent on private enrichment and exaltation.

The Common Man naturally and properly desires that men and women shall be happy; but, thanks to being uneducated, only trained, he devotes little or no attention to the consideration of what it is that

makes people happy. In consequence, he pursues ends too easy and too obvious, ends which do not conduce to contentment and joy, ends the attainment of which cannot result in other than disillusionment, fretfulness, rebellion against life, division within his own soul, and conflict between frustrated individuals, frustrated classes, frustrated nations. It is in an atmosphere of general spiritual malaise caused by a pursuit of inadequate goals, that modern educators live and move and work. Most of them have by now become as confused as the rest of mankind about the nature of the good life. They cannot civilize the Common Man's children because they have surrendered to the Common Man.

The leading of the Common Man's children into gentility is not something that can be attended to after they are fairly well grown-up. It is not primarily a matter to be dealt with by colleges and universities or even by high schools. These must work on material furnished them, mostly formed by the time it emerges from the lower schools; by the time it reaches higher education it has jelled. What needs first to be done for the progeny of the emancipated masses is to reform our lower schools, to restore in them certain basic training which they seem, perhaps inadvertently, to have abandoned.

First, we need to realize again that those who teach small children must devise and impart ways of giving to those children some knowledge of the basic wisdom of the race. They must foster a sense of identi-

fication with the tried and tested customs and attitudes of our forefathers. It is not the business of schoolmasters to teach their pupils what the pupils wish to learn, certainly not to let them behave as they desire, but rather to impart to them wisdom distilled out of the race's long experience, that which the past has learned about what human beings ought to know and to do, and to persuade them that they like it. The business of the school and the home and the church is to feed the lambs, not to amuse the young goats.

This training in the urbane tradition is not hard to give; children desire to be grown-up and they imitate the kind of grownupness that is set in front of them. The *mores* of civilization can be put around them for sustenance, and this with no great trouble, if only we rid ourselves of the poisonous notions that children are at their best and happiest when encouraged to do as they please and that our ancestors were incompetent.

Second, new emphasis is needed, in dealing with youngsters under fifteen or so, on those formative studies which always have been and still are prerequisite for proficiency in thinking and purpose in doing—the disciplines of word, number, form. Children certainly need to be taught how to read, write, listen to and speak the English language, if not with elegance and charm at least with clarity. Most Americans cannot read anything more difficult than a picture paper or a pulp magazine; they cannot write a letter and make their meaning plain; they rarely

speaking except in clichés; they are unable to follow an argument put in the simplest words, to understand what a speaker is driving at. What chance have people to mature when there is no competent interchange of ideas? Our lower schools may be ever so good at conducting courses in "citizenship" and "nature study," though there are those who doubt it when they look at the product; but their main business is and will remain teaching boys and girls how to read, write, speak, listen, figure, and handle things. Unless the lower schools can do a far better job of work on these basic necessities, there will be less and less growing up among Americans.

Third, there will be little increase in civilized maturity without new emphasis in the homes, assisted by the churches and schools, on decent manners. Children must be taught to respect the rights of others. Here again social pressures must be exerted, quietly but firmly, by teachers, parents, spiritual directors. We Americans have all around the world the unenviable reputation of being the most inconsiderate folk on earth. Discourtesy is at once an evidence and a cause of immaturity. If it be true that "a community without courtesy is neither civilized nor safe," what price America? *

* Dr Samuel A Nock writes "We are doing nothing about manners. Our students who have not been in the armed forces, where they learned to act deferentially (a long way from first-rate manners), or who have not been employed in filling stations, usually know nothing of manners in any way or shape. Such guidance as once led men and women to become ladies and gentlemen might make ladies and gentlemen of our boys and girls. And let there be no misunderstanding by ladies and gentlemen I

Fourth, the homes, with the aid of schools and churches, must get it across to children that honest and craftsmanlike achievement is the only door to social approval, that the human being who works "to get by," who seeks rewards he has not earned, is a low fellow and should be treated accordingly. Rewards and deprivations are not fashionable any more in schools. This is too bad, for children are quick-witted enough to see that, if the sloppy worker gets the same treatment as his careful and diligent brother, there is small incentive to going in for stiff creative endeavor.*

Still another element must enter into the training of the Common Man's child if that child is to grow up to be more than the flattered slave of those who would exploit him by force or by cajolery. The Liberal Man, the would-be Free Man, has always been, will always

mean not affected fops or holders of medieval titles, but such people as founded the Republic of the United States of America. The basis of judgment was, for such ladies and gentlemen, whether a matter was in good taste. Our boys and girls don't even know what that phrase means." *College and University*, January 1948, p. 290

* An increasing number of American public-school systems, including those in the two largest Atlantic-seaboard cities, have for some time now been promoting all children from grade to grade at the end of each academic year. Every child in every grade is sent on into the next grade regardless of his or her achievement or nonachievement. This Alice-in-Wonderlandish practice—"Everybody has won," said the Dodo, "and all must have prizes"—is defended on the ground that not to promote would create a psychically dangerous sense of inferiority. Another possible reason for it may be that in these systems the instruction is so bad and the morale so low that if only competent children were promoted, the lower grades would be unspeakably overcrowded. Imagine the premium put on laziness and inefficiency by such nonsense as this! Consider it as a character builder!

be, a man of religion. Something must be done to prevent the continued rearing of a citizenry the major part of whom have not learned to reverence the ultimate mystery which lies beneath and beyond the visible and tangible. Of this more in a later chapter. Suffice it to say now that Americans have made a tragic mistake in education by creating a cleavage between religion and secular learning. Such a divorcement cuts off our people in their formative years from the contemplation of human limitations, discourages them through sheer fear from facing up to the unavoidable frustration of earthly ambition and the inevitability of death, prevents humility and compassion, without which no man can be called in any true sense a citizen or human. It is neither possible nor necessary that our schools teach any one particular religion; for such teaching we must depend upon the home and on the church. We have a right, however, to insist that the schools inspire reverence for the Unseen and also that they impart some objective knowledge of what the various faiths about us are and do and teach—enough to dispel intolerance begotten by ignorance. Americans will never be mature if all they recognize as real are the things of *this* and *now*, as long as they deal forever with *what* and never with *why*.

So much in general for what in the more elementary years of schooling must be done toward the civilizing of the Common Man's child, the Common Man of tomorrow.

4. The High School

SHORTLY before the latest war this country was visited by a European educator whose job it is to supervise secondary schools in his country, a man who knows this field as well as anyone living. At the close of a trip which took him to all parts of America, he was given a dinner in New York at which he was asked what he thought of the American high school. Anxious to avoid "a certain condescension in foreigners," he spoke about our wonderful school buildings and equipment, about the courtesies extended to him everywhere, and so on. Those present thanked him but insisted that what they really wished to know was what is wrong with our secondary education. "It is very simple, that," he replied. "Everywhere I went I found that the pupils were pleased condescendingly to like the teachers."

Pondering this saying, I remembered another by the late Frederick J. E. Woodbridge, that ripe scholar and urbane observer of things intellectual, shortly before he resigned his administrative work as dean of the graduate faculties at Columbia University. "After seventeen years here in what is in numbers one of the largest and in reputation not the least graduate school

in America," Dr. Woodbridge declared, "I am certain of at least one thing, a marked and progressive decrease in the intellectual maturity of those graduates of our American school system and our colleges who present themselves for advanced scholarly training." Dr. Woodbridge repeated this a number of times. He included something like it in his valedictory report to the president of his university.

It is a startling charge to make, especially when it is recalled that the dean spoke not of average collegians but of the cream of the crop, men who desire and ask the stern training of graduate study and research which leads on to the doctorate and beyond. It is also interesting—in view of the vast sums spent on collegiate development in the last four decades and the still vaster sums spent on secondary schools, in view of the advertised strides in the development of what pretends to be a science of teaching, in view of confident assertions of pedagogical theorists, in view of free curricula, personnel-study schemes, psychological tests, counseling both directive and nondirective, general examinations, all the other plausible devices for getting better and better education—to note not merely that Dr. Woodbridge found intellectual immaturity prevalent among graduate students but also that he deemed it increasing year by year. It is further of some significance that, despite his having repeated the charge on a number of occasions, nobody in his own university or elsewhere ventured to deny the truth of what he said.

If it be the business of our educational system to produce, among those who present themselves for scholarly specialization, a considerable group of persons who, once they are through school and college, can do intellectual work of reasonable maturity and competence, then our educational system would seem to be less and less effective. This is a disturbing thought; and somehow it stays in one's mind, despite all the efforts of cheerful persons to charm one into serenity by assurances that illiteracy is decreasing among us or that many more children than formerly now go on to secondary school and college. These things may be sources of a proper joy. Nevertheless, the disconcerting picture remains of an increasing immaturity at the top of the intellectual pile.

Not long ago my duties required me to attend a regional convention of what is probably the most reputable association of secondary schools in America, an old and respectable body. Its judgments carry great weight. For an entire two days this convention discussed what a modern secondary school ought properly to teach.

There seemed to be a general agreement among those present that such schools should teach the things—and only the things—which seemed to them best. There was to be paid little or no regard, for instance, any longer to the opinions of the colleges. It was openly stated, to large applause, that by steering good students to complacent colleges and away from those which had old-fashioned expectations, the school

could break down any and all resistance from above. As for the possible desire or opinion of parents, that was not even mentioned. One of the first assumptions in American education is that fathers and mothers are invariably incompetent and that teachers, under the direction of skilled scientists in education, are the proper and almost infallible guides of youth. Unfortunately, most parents are so impressed by the mumbo-jumbo obfuscation created by schoolmasters as a class that they dare not protest; and consequently the group of which we are speaking was perhaps excusable in ignoring parental opinion. At any rate, it was calmly assumed that the intellectual training of American boys and girls between the ages of twelve and eighteen was going to be dictated, without the veto of anybody, by those professional practitioners who already control our secondary schools.

To what they had to say I listened from the first with interest, for I knew that they spoke the more than possible truth about their immense power and its probable further development. Then, as they went on talking, I became more interested than ever, for all of a sudden I remembered Dr. Woodbridge's complaint. The immaturity of incipient scholars, the inadequate preparation of those who were eventually to go on into scholarly pursuits or into active creative labor, the increasing childishness of American culture, were largely due to these same good, fine, sincere men and women who were talking so calmly.

As I listened to them hour after hour while they

outlined their ideal program for the high school of the future, it was apparent that they were far more concerned with coddling the young minds committed to their charge than they were with strengthening and maturing those minds. In former days, I told myself, it was assumed by everybody that the primary business of schools is the training of minds to function effectively. It was assumed that people with trained minds can be entrusted to acquire information and practical techniques on their own hook. These ladies and gentlemen apparently believed nothing of the sort. They were all for broadening, what they called "orientating," evidently on the assumption that this was not only the school's first business but almost its only business; they took it as a matter of course that their young charges would mature automatically. But, as I well know and as Dr. Woodbridge and people like him have insisted, this is not apt to take place. I suspected that what was wrong was a misconception on the part of the educators about what boys and girls of teen age are actually like and what they must somehow or other grow into if they are to matter in an adult world.

What, according to these people who were talking so earnestly, appeared to be the ideal curriculum for a secondary school? Their prescription may sound incredible to those who have not troubled to keep abreast of "progress in educational science." One of these speakers was a well-known professor in a widely renowned teachers college. Another was the head-

master of one of our most respected boarding schools, an institution which in the past has been known for its keen-minded, far-thinking graduates, though lately it has somewhat fallen off. A third had charge of all the high schools in a great metropolis. These men and others nearly as well known as they spoke as with authority; and none dared—or cared—to say them nay.

In details these experts differed from one another, but they seemed to agree fairly well that the high schools should teach five things. These were: *stimulating literature* (but not grammar, rhetoric, “letters” generally, all of which were pronounced difficult and dull); *science* (as a series of great proven theories and an attitude of mind but with little or no emphasis upon such a monotonous thing as laboratory technique); *social sciences* (which meant history—not the fact-and-date kind but “social interpretation”—and “what our government is like”); *appreciation of art* (but not, apparently, any piano practice or voice production or drill with modeling tools and pencil); and *mathematics* (with strong protest against old-fashioned things like algebra, geometry, and trigonometry and with stress upon “mathematics as related to life”). Other subjects were regarded as of scarcely any moment whatever.

It would be easy to make fun of such a well-intentioned curriculum. Almost anybody can point out that no literature can be really stimulating to a boy or girl who has not been taught to read, write, and

speaking accurately, and that the inner beauty of literary style is imperceptible except to him who has learned through trial the bitter difficulty of making those recalcitrant servants, words, obey the inner will and truly mirror ideas. There would still seem to be some necessity for spelling, grammar, rhetoric.

It can be said with equal ease and truth that to every reputable scientist science is a *method* for getting at sensible facts and not, except incidentally and always under suspicion, a set of theories or a philosophy; that scientists know, even though pedagogues may forget, that a scientist can be made only after weary years of meticulous laboratory routine.

As for the social sciences, if they really are sciences, these too involve grueling technical drill, the facilities for which cannot exist in any secondary school ever seen in any country and the opportunity for which involves freedom of research impossible to boys and girls in their teens. Or, if they are *not* sciences, they are very likely to degenerate into sheer sentimentality on the one hand or into dogmatic demagoguery on the other.

As for the fine arts, artists at least know that trying to teach an abstract and detached "appreciation" of them is little more than a waste of time. Criticism of the arts belongs properly to the initiated, and the initiation consists in long practice by which man tries to learn how he can make form, sound, color obey his will. To say that a teacher can instruct Willie, a boy who cannot make any music and would not

if he could, in how to appreciate Bach or Shostakovich, or lead Mary Jane, who reluctantly pretends to draw once in a while because she must or go to the principal, in how properly to estimate Rembrandt or Matisse, is grotesque.

As for "mathematics related to life," since that convention I have been asking every mathematician that I could lay hold on what such a thing might be, and not one of them has had the faintest idea, unless possibly such a subject might consist of a few simple tricks of mensuration. A number of them have indignantly insisted that, since mathematics is the only absolute science, life must be related to it and not the other way about.

It would not be difficult to make a joke out of these proposals, but it would be unwise. This is a matter of considerable seriousness. From it results a great deal of educational malpractice, none the less to be regretted because the malpractitioners are for the most part well-meaning people. Nor is it right ever to employ the weapon of ridicule against those who are deeply and conscientiously in earnest.

Too many modern pedagogues contend with all seriousness that proper education is informative education—if only one can make the field of facts both immediate to the student and widening to his general interests—instead of functional, as the older and wiser pedagogy always insisted. In their desire to be advanced in educational thinking many of those who teach teachers have reverted to the most primitive

of educational notions, that an educated man is one who merely relates himself to his environment. They have forgotten that a really mature and effective person is one who, having discovered his environment, has learned how to relate that environment to himself, courageously and successfully.

Inadequate though the theory may be, those who hold it have more and more assumed control of the secondary schools. They bully the colleges, dominate conventions and journals, impart their ideas to larger and larger numbers of young men and women who are being trained for teaching. These later transform bright children, many of whom might become thinkers and scholars and effective people generally, into demanding dabblers, impatient alike of labor and logic. This is no subject for laughter.

The reward without the quest, the prize without training for the race, Heaven without probation, wages without work, a master's prestige without a master's skill, a trade without an apprenticeship! How much our secondary-school educational practice is a reflection of the current American desire to obtain by affirmation instead of by hard labor or how much that absurd expectation is the result of secondary education as we have it, would be difficult to determine; but that the two have a connection seems plain enough. Behind all the emphasis upon informing and "orientating" children of high-school age is a conviction that the trade of thinking can be learned without much, if any, hard and directed practice.

Somehow or other quite a few of us do not think this is so. Exactly as a woodworker must laboriously learn how to saw and plane and chisel and nail before he can be expected to do decent bits of carpentering; as a painter must master by hard discipline the manipulation of color, the organization of chiaroscuro, the delineation of perspective, the subordination of detail before he can be expected to produce a picture that anyone but a baby will bother to look at; as a musician, before he can compose or perform, must learn what it means to make pure sounds and to combine them in harmonies and rhythms—even so he who would become a man of intellectual mastery must by long drill learn to do four things. He must learn how to sense things adequately, to feel and evaluate other persons, to understand and accurately to use language so that he can augment his own small experience with that of others, and to think abstractly. Anybody who can learn to do these four things with reasonable competency will at length arrive at something that approaches maturity. Anybody who knows how to do them with reasonable competency, for one thing, is suitable material for a college. Anyone who does not should not be admitted into higher education.

It is not the business of the graduate and professional schools of a university to impart such fundamental training, but rather to furnish facilities for persons who are already so trained to go on and become scholars. It is not the business of a college, as

distinct from the graduate parts of a university, to begin this training, but rather to complete training begun lower down and then to initiate the undergraduate into a little at least of the joys of scholarship. Neither the college nor the university can do its proper work if the secondary schools continue to send it freshmen who have come to the age of eighteen or so without having learned the elementary disciplines. This is true no matter how widely they have been "orientated." The blame for what is wrong with American intellectuality and American effectiveness and American honesty of achievement rests chiefly upon the secondary schools.

As a plain matter of fact, most college freshmen, charming lads and lasses though in many ways they be, cannot do the things that may reasonably be expected of them if they are ever to become mature thinkers or effective workers. They cannot look at a thing and tell you what they see; listen to sounds and know what they hear; by the touch truly perceive form; sense how others feel and why; read, write, speak with any sure knowledge of how words are to be handled or of what other people's phrases mean; or, finally, think in general terms as distinct from specific and concrete particulars. It is difficult properly to teach them science because they know next to nothing about sense perceptiveness; to instruct them in morals, manners, politics, history, or religion, for they have not begun to learn how to evaluate and respect other persons; to impart knowledge of philosophy to

those who do not know what "abstract" means; or to do much of anything with them until one has taught them to read, write, speak, cipher, and observe with the five senses.

In consequence of the lack of preparation which their freshmen have had, our contemporary colleges with sadness now expect to devote at least half of the four short years in which they have their students to an attempt to supply the training which ought previously to have been given, which would fifty years ago have been given to anyone who was going on into higher education, which now is given in other countries. At eighteen years of age an English lad or one on the continent, if he has mind enough to justify his going into higher education at all, is ready for the university. At the same age in this country he is mostly an untrained young cub. It takes the junior college years, and sometimes the senior college years as well, to lick him into such shape that he may begin to work for himself with the competency that one had the right to expect of him when he was graduated from high school.

The most tragic part of this calamitous situation is that frequently by the time he is through college and has learned what he should have learned in preparatory school it is too late to do anything else with him. There has been such a ghastly waste of time! An undergraduate with flabby mental habits, acquired in a school where he has been permitted to devote his formative years to playing around in easy-

going monkeyshines, is often incapable of acquiring later on either the elements of the trade of thought or the knack of earning an honest living.

There are few who suggest that the subjects taught in the old-fashioned secondary school are the only ones proper for the training of boys and girls in the trade of thinking, the only ones adequately designed to prepare men and women for the college, the university, the professions, or effective work generally. That the old-fashioned secondary school did do this kind of preparation better than the secondary school common among us today, is a certainty. Latin and Greek did teach language *qua* language. There was almost no instruction in English, but young people who learned how to use other languages found themselves surprisingly proficient in the use of their own. The courtesy, good manners, religion which characterized the older schools did impart what came at last to be an illuminating sort of second nature, a revelation of human values. The use of symbols and graphs in algebra and geometry and trigonometry and the insistence upon the supremacy of logic in mathematics generally did make for sound abstract thinking. Only in science was the old curriculum definitely defective, but the newer training has not remedied that defect. If anyone doubts this, a careful examination of the high-school texts and procedures in general science, which is about all the science most pupils ever take, will be an eye opener. It may well be that there are other courses which can be substituted for

the traditional *subjects of study*; but surely nothing ought to be allowed to replace the older *functional objectives*. Those who advocate the new subjects often seem to suppose that their critics are vexed merely because they are no longer willing to teach the ancient languages or some other particular course sanctioned by tradition. This is not the real source of criticism. The point is that the older schools taught *their students to think* and that the newer schools mostly do not.

There may be those who will rise at this point to object that the function of a secondary school in a democratic society is not primarily to prepare boys and girls for a liberal education later on but rather to give them sound vocational training. Perhaps this is as good a place as any to consider the alleged conflict between these two things, for it is in the high school that the dispute first comes to the fore. In the grammar school it does no more than begin to arise, for two reasons: first, children usually show before the age of fourteen or fifteen not much basic differentiation between word-mindedness and hand-mindedness, and, second, economic pressures are not apt at an earlier age to be strongly influential.

Much of the current argument between liberal educators and vocational educators seems artificial. Obviously everyone should both earn a living and live it once it has been earned; this is true whether his labor be in the field of thought or in more prosaic employments. The true aim of education must consist

in teaching *both* how to do a reputable job *and also* how to be a human being and enjoy life.

Whether in the secondary schools or in the colleges to which so many of their graduates go these days or in still later fields of mature activity, liberal education, which has to do with being, and vocational training, which has to do with doing, are properly not only inseparable but interdependent. One's vision of meaning is colored by the effectiveness of one's creative activity. Conversely, one's labors have meaning only to the extent that one comes to perceive their place in cosmic process or, at least, their relationship to the ends that are essentially human. It is wicked to go in for the sort of liberal education which produces incompetent dreamers. It is equally wicked to rely on uninterpreted vocational training to turn out men and women of understanding and wisdom. Liberal education and vocational training are two parts of one task; neither must crowd out or disdain the other.*

* The sort of vocational education which aims at turning out graduates with specialized technical skills is hardly what is wanted in the high schools. "The great majority of workers in modern industry and agriculture are semiskilled. They are not specialists. Particularly at the time of entry on first employment, the young worker today in most lines of industry does not need to have developed a high degree of technical skill in some occupation. Industry expects to give its workers the necessary specific training after they enter employment." Russell and Judd, *The American Educational System*, Houghton Mifflin Company Boston, 1940.

A proper vocational education consists in training the mind and body with reasonable competence to approach and perform normal acts of creativity. To attempt anything more specific than this in the schools constitutes educational malpractice, but so also is not to attempt to give every boy and girl at least this much.

Recognition of this dual necessity and this mutual value cannot but make a thoughtful American uncomfortable for, as a matter of fact, we have gone in for overemphasis on vocational training beginning with the high school, done it so dangerously as almost to ignore the claims of unifying interpretation. In consequence, our education is lopsided to the point of absurdity. There was a time, perhaps, when American educators too much ignored the educative value of man's labors, the necessity of their being well mastered and well pursued. Our danger now is that we have become so intent on skillful activity that we ignore almost everything else.

What we need is for educators to realize—and to sell the idea to the populace generally—that no one can be called decently educated until he shows a shrewd conception of what it means to be a human being, an appreciative understanding of human greatness and goodness, a knowledge of what those people are like who in any and every generation rise from the ruck of men and women to become the honored, the revered, the beloved of the generations that come after them. To impart such an understanding is the purpose of liberal studies and their justification. Initiation into vision comes from the study of history, the arts, and above all literature, more especially poetry, religion, ethics, science too, but science pursued for love of nature and of man, which is not the way science is usually taught today. Every high-school student, every adult for that matter, has a right to be

exposed to liberal studies. Equally, nobody can properly be called educated unless he is equipped to do some useful job, to do it as well as he possibly can, expertly to manipulate things or words or machines or ideas with a craftsman's pride; no child should be deprived of such training as will enable him to function efficiently as a sharer in the world's manifold work.

Three points are to be noted:

The first point is that neither the liberal discipline nor the vocational discipline properly exists as an end apart from the pupil. In any decent educational system liberal studies are never included in order to promote learning for learning's sake (which is even more repellent to a decent person than art for art's sake). Nor is vocational training imparted in order to provide a supply of cheap laborers to be enslaved in mass production for someone's profit.

The second point is that it is deadly to healthful schooling to regard (as is often the case) the liberal studies as something prerequisite for "more practical" studies, something to be gotten out of the way so that the really important vocational training can begin. The two sorts of study should stand side by side all through the high school, all through the college later on, indeed all through life, illuminating one another, enriching one another, ennobling one another.

The third point is that the American high school is, with the usual rare exceptions, efficient neither in liberal studies nor in vocational studies. I am reminded of the late Bishop of Rhode Island, who once

reproached his clergy. "I tell you," he said, "that you do not pray or read as you should; you reply that you are too busy for that, pastoring your people. When I complain that you neglect your people, you answer that you are so occupied at the altar and in your studies that you have no time left for pastoring." Our secondary schools claim that their deep interest in book learning prevents good teaching of the crafts, and vice versa. The plain fact is that they tolerate such slipshod achievement in both disciplines as prevents effectiveness in either. They play around with muddled thinking; they play around with careless craftsmanship. They send off for further liberal education boys and girls grossly unfitted for it. They send into the trades and into business uninterested dabblers and sloppy workers. They encourage the notion that success and reputation come by mere desire rather than by hard labor. Most of those who teach in the secondary schools realize well enough this dual incompetence, but they rarely say anything about it. Why? Because they are persuaded that Uncle Sam and his wife are pleased as Punch with the American high school as it is, that if they told the truth about it they would lose their jobs for their pains.*

* A high-school principal in New York once said to me, "I do not run an educational institution. My real business is to keep adolescent boys and girls, regardless of educational aptitude and desire or the lack of them, from running the streets, getting into trouble, and becoming an intolerable nuisance in the community. The easiest way to keep them willing to submit to the school's control and so, incidentally, to hold my job, is to provide for them a vast amount of amusement and a minimum of work to do." That he was not, perhaps, too exceptionally cynical is

It would seem to be high time for a rising on the part of pupils, teachers, parents, the public generally against those who are in control of American high schools, a revolt not in the name of reaction but in the name of common sense, a revolt against a false radicalism which seems to believe that in things of the mind there need be no roots. If such a rising be possible—and there are indications that the demand for it is becoming stronger every day—possibly in the year 2000 or so Dr. Woodbridge's successor as the head of the graduate school at Columbia may be able to utter a less mournful valedictory. Perhaps by that date, too, those who take on the usual secondary-school graduate in business or industry or agriculture and try to get out of him craftsmanlike accomplishment may feel a little less strongly than such people do now that the millions of dollars which we devote

indicated by what is hinted at by more than one educational authority who comments on developments today in the American high school

Not all of these are as bluntly honest as Professors Russell and Judd of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, who write. "Most young people today are not able to enter industry or other types of gainful employment before age eighteen, in many cases not before age twenty. *The best method of occupying the time of such young people is an important problem, and the solution of this problem by requiring an extended educational period, regardless of the immediate value of the education as such, may be socially wise*" (The italics are mine) They go on to say that in all probability instruction will have to be cast in a new mold, which pays small heed either to academic disciplines or to vocational demands, if education is to be "made of sufficient interest to appeal to most young people in this country." *The American Educational System*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1940

Alas for those exceptional (?) American youngsters who wish to be helped to think and act rather than to be entertained!

every year to high-school education are, for the most part, money spent for the retarding of intelligence, the discouragement of efficiency, the stunting of character.

5. Higher Education and Intelligence

IN THE last two chapters we have been thinking of some of the ways in which our lower schools and secondary schools are failing the Common Man's children, failing them if those children are to participate in the good life as it is revealed by racial experience, failing them if they are to mature in wisdom and enjoyment of life as they grow in years, failing them if they are to savor but not overvalue the abundance which modern technology makes possible for them, failing them if they are to act as citizens with a competency sufficient to preserve our way of life. We may perhaps consider now whether or not our colleges and universities are attending to their share of the business. Their chief concern is, I take it, to furnish the Common Man with the kind of leadership necessary if the community is to function beneficently.

Some things our universities and colleges look after quite well. They do a decent job training in technology. They are not half bad in giving the boys and girls a smattering of literature, snips of history, titbits from the philosophers—enough for them to chatter superficially at a dinner party or in the lounge of a club and get by. Our higher education is pro-

ficient—and this is about the best thing that can be said for it—in imparting to a few emerging scholars some knowledge of the facts and processes in this, that, or the other specialized field. With those few we do pretty well at encouraging erudition. But none of these things, good as it is in itself, nor all of them put together, constitutes the most important business of higher education. Unless from our institutions of advanced learning emerge those trained in discrimination, wise about man's true end and about the proper function of the State in furthering a pursuit of that end, they have failed us seriously, perilously.

In 1903 I was one of a group of freshmen who entered the University of Chicago. We were put through what nowadays in the pedagogue's patois is called "preliminary orientation"; in other words, we were exposed to a certain amount of good advice in the hope that a little of it might register. One thing did—with me, anyway. There stood before us the president of the university, Dr. William Rainey Harper, and this, as I recall it, is what he said:

"Young gentlemen, you have come here in hope of furthering your education. If you are to do this it would be well for you to have some idea of what an educated human being is. Then you will know what to aim at here, what this institution exists to assist you to become. An educated man is a man who by the time he is twenty-five years old has a clear theory, formed in the light of human experience down the ages, of what constitutes a satisfying life, a significant

life, and who by the age of thirty has a moral philosophy consonant with racial experience. If a man reaches these ages without having arrived at such a theory, such a philosophy, then no matter how many facts he has learned or how many processes he has mastered, that man is an ignoramus and a fool, unhappy, probably dangerous. That is all. Good afternoon."

This may indeed be all that needs to be said; but perhaps we may profitably think a little more about its implications. Not only Dr. Harper but all the greatest thinkers since Plato have insisted that the formulation of a moral philosophy is fundamental to the education of the free man; and it is just here that the American colleges and universities with rare exception are falling down on the job. They assist very few of their students to discover what in the light of agelong experience the would-be wise man is to try to become. By their neglect they graduate into the citizenry throngs of muddle-headed men and women, many of whom, if they had not been submitted to malpractice, might have turned out to be truly gay and happy people, understanding and effective leaders of the commonalty. Instead, blind men are ejected into society to lead other blind men till both fall into the ditch. We do not produce leaders of mankind into sane living; we are content to produce technicians. What is a technician? Sir Richard Livingstone, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, sometime vice-chancellor of that university, has defined a technician

as "a man who understands everything about his job except its ultimate purpose and its place in the order of the universe."

This grotesque missing of the point is modern. Take a look at higher education in the not-too-distant past. Fifty years ago the curriculum of almost every college in this country was still centered around a basic study of moral philosophy. Teaching was then in accord with what the wise have always known to be fundamental. The abandonment of a central concern with morals has been not only unprecedented; it is of a near completeness that is startling. A sampling poll of American institutions of higher learning made a couple of years ago revealed that of the million and a half students then enrolled in our colleges, universities, and normal schools, less than one in twenty devoted any time whatever from matriculation to graduation to a systematic study of ethics, the science of the good life. How can people trained to master any number of facts and to perform any number of technical tricks but not to understand what matters for human safety and happiness furnish leadership except into blundering confusion? Our higher education has ceased to train the gifted few from whom interpretative leadership of the Common Man must come, the men and women of intelligence.* Our

* While this book was in press, Dr. Oliver Martin, of Ohio University, issued his monograph, *Two Educators Hutchins and Conant*, which deals with the conflict between morals and expediency in American education. He says "It all begins innocently. . . . Knowledge is reduced to the formal and the factual, theoretical difficulties are reduced to the syn-

colleges and universities, if we are to judge them by present performance instead of by venerable profession, seem for the most part unaware of what is meant by intelligence and therefore, quite understandably, do next to nothing to encourage it.

"Intelligence" comes from *inter* (between) and *legere* (to choose); properly understood it means "ability to discriminate." It is by intelligence that one knows the beautiful from the ugly, the permanently valuable from the transient, the good from the bad, the better from the merely good. By exercising intelligence one sees things as they are rather than as they are momentarily esteemed to be by the crowds which shout mass judgments at us. Intelligence must be discovered and then trained; it does not mature by chance or develop as the by-product of a skill. One may be learned in philology or no end of a salesman or an able surgeon or an effective atomic scientist or a skilled mechanic or a great artist or proficient in any one of a hundred kinds of specialized knowing and doing and yet remain unintelligent, incompetent to recognize comparative values, unable to make considered choices or to guide other men into choices

thetical and semantic, and the practical becomes identical with the 'useful' and the 'expedient' . . . No distinction is recognized between the kind of compromise that is based on principle and the kind that is not . . . Not the scholar, the thinker, the statesman, or the prophet, but *the public-relations man who can 'smooth out' human relations on a sub-intellectual level then becomes the important person in the college and university administration*" (The italics are mine) Oliver Martin, *Two Educators*. Hutchins and Conant, Henry Regnery Company, 1948.

requisite for happiness or even for human continuance.

In a civilization like ours, which has slipped its cultural moorings and is dangerously adrift, to be intelligent is, to be sure, a thing uncomfortable, not to say dangerous. This is true because in such an era intelligence involves rebellion against the mores—not rebellion of an adolescent kind, for the sake of being different, or nihilistic rebellion, which is demonic in its pride, but rebellion because the state of things as they are today in every country of importance is largely subhuman. When fashion, whether in the realm of incidentals or in the more important realm of ideas, is as vastly exploited as it is in these times, as generally controlled by advertisement or coercion or a combination of the two, the man of trained intelligence is of necessity in revolt, often to his serious inconvenience and even peril, against the popular conceits. He resents the complacent narrow-mindedness and foolish aphorisms of the day, its childish desire to eat its cake and have it too, its avoidance of all considerations that seem inconvenient, its willingness to measure greatness in terms of size and wealth and force, its brag, its confusion between progress and the mere passing of time, its astounding assumption that man has improved morally along with his changing environment, its disregard of racial experience, its pulling down of the blinds over the windows of faith and then bewailing (or rejoicing) that the old light shines no more, above all, its naïve

forgetfulness of the inevitability and speed of death.

Partly because intelligence is necessarily so uncomfortable we have no ardent desire for it either for ourselves or for our children. Why then should the colleges and universities be expected to stress the cultivation of such an unpalatable talent? Does the possession of trained intelligence tend to make a man wealthy? Not in the least. Will it result in popularity? Far from it. The plebs and those who manage the plebs for their own profit are bound to detest the man of discrimination because he is offended by meaningless noises, because he refuses to keep step, because of the embarrassing comprehensions with which, be he never so kindhearted, he flicks them on the raw. Will intelligence make one happy? Only with a happiness which here on earth is nearly allied to tears.

Intelligence, which most of us esteem so lightly, often seems unimportant in times of relative ease, when things can and do run along on their own steam; but intelligence becomes suddenly indispensable when a society is torn, as ours is, by manifold revolution. We begin to see that without the intelligent few to criticize, to furnish counsel, to help us understand, we are destined to sink under stress to the level of a cage of contending beasts. We begin to suspect that it is not enough to understand all things but the truth.

It is only knowing the truth about man that can make a culture safe or free, and the truth about man is the facts about man *truly evaluated*. Social organi-

zation, systems, mechanisms are of secondary importance; it is intelligence—flexible, curious, alert, trained to discern values—which is essential for social stability or spiritual poise. If our civilization is to break the precedent set by all its predecessors and survive, it will not be saved from ruin by unled majorities who blindly pursue the obvious but less-than-human ends of money, amusement, applause, self-glorification, nor by efficient technicians in their spare time. It will be saved, if at all, by leaders of trained intelligence.

Those who control our universities and colleges, like most other people, seem only vaguely aware that Western civilization can no longer run along on inertia, that it is in crisis, that it needs morally sound guidance, must have such guidance or perish. They do not seem to realize that things are so basically out of joint that we have no time left for slow and gradual betterment. Back of the books on higher education which one reads and the addresses on it which one hears and the allegedly improved plans and curricula which one observes, there is almost always an assumption that our society is going to jog along in a leisurely and evolutionary manner, under guidance that has no need to be other than cautiously experimental. This is an assumption fantastic in the light of what has been happening in the last fifty years, in the light of what is happening day by day. We are in the midst of revolution, revolution rapid and unprepared for, revolution in realms artistic, economic, political, in-

ternational, moral (or immoral), religious (or anti-religious). This revolution may be good or bad, beneficial to man or tending, in C. S. Lewis's phrase, to the abolition of man; at any rate, we are in the midst of it. It is a revolution which cannot safely be left to develop as it will. It tends too rapidly to become irrational and emotional.

To avoid disaster this bewildered age must be dealt with vigorously, courageously, at once, dealt with by those who have been educated to understand the true nature of the one constant in all the turmoil. That constant is man himself, man who, during thousands of years, while a score of civilizations have been born and matured and disintegrated, has remained in all essentials the same creature, moved by the same hungers, ruined by the same follies and passions, arriving at inner satisfactions (when they have been attained) by a changeless road. In times of slow and peaceful growth the studies which develop an understanding of human beings as more than creatures of circumstance may without immediate disaster be given a secondary status in higher education; this is not true in times of revolution. For much too long the colleges and universities have neglected consideration of man *in esse* and *in posse* as he is revealed by the long experience of humanity.

If, as is the case, our higher education is producing little in the way of an understanding and critical intelligence, let no one forget that the blame for it rests not alone on those who direct higher education and

teach in terms of it but on all of us. What the Common Man desires, demands, is willing to pay for, that he gets.* We have not been insisting, not often even suggesting, that the colleges and universities take our brilliant young men and women and send them back to us intelligent, discriminating, able to show others what were good to be done. We have asked of higher education only lesser services, and we have been given what we have required. When we persistently, insultingly demand that it attend once more to its chief business with a vigor and speed worthy of its centrality, when we demand that it turn out leaders who are aware of what has always been and is and always will be the good life and who have the courage to tell us the truth about ourselves, only then will higher education recover from its easygoing trust, which is our own easygoing trust, in the adequacy of knowing facts, mastering processes, and making minor adjustments. Only in response to indignant demand is it in the least likely that our higher education will do other than

* The chief reason for the small service rendered by education as is toward civilizing the Common Man and his children is nowhere better given than by the late William Allen White: "The rise in the economic status of the average American family has made it possible for thousands of young people to go to colleges who have no cultural background whatever, who are not interested in books or reading, who regard education as merely an equipment for making a living. . . . They are strangers to the academic life, as isolated and remote as the wild savage in the forest." Quoted by J. P. Gavit, *College*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York.

R. T. Ely has pointed out in his autobiography that poverty may mean not only a lack of means for satisfying the higher wants but also a lack of wants for the higher goods. *Ground Under Our Feet*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938.

continue on its imperceptive way, hiding at any cost from the question "Why?", furnishing no leadership worth mentioning.

So far we have been saying little more than this: that before our institutions of advanced learning will set about training intelligent leadership for us we must desire them to do just that and make our desire plain. Of course, this is not the end of the story but only its beginning. The second task facing higher education, once it has been aroused, is a task of selection.

Most students now in college can never be made into persons competent to lead anyone, even themselves. Not only are they in residence with other, lesser ends in view, but also most of them are not endowed with the kind of mind that may be developed to any great degree of discrimination. From birth their synaptic connections have been too slow for that. In the jargon of the moment, their IQ's (intelligence quotients) are too low. They share the more pedestrian lot of most of God's children. They are human beings and as such are of infinite worth, beloved of the Deity and to be loved by the brethren, but their *chief* activity is bound to be the hewing of wood and drawing of water and tending of machines. These labors are honorable and necessary—even the intelligent minority neglects a share in the common toil at peril to its sane humility—but to follow them does not in itself make for discrimination. We should teach everyone to discriminate to the full extent of what facility

he or she may have for discrimination, but we should not expect too much from run of mine folks nor lead them to overvalue their ability.

As early as possible after their students arrive, the colleges should find the few who are potentially intelligent (they may come from rich parents or poor, from slum homes or from palaces) and both encourage and train them in terms of their superior diacritical powers. It is from this chosen group that the interpreters and directors of a sane common life must come. It is they whom we now neglect. We do not separate them from the crowd and give them their chance. Instead, we encourage and develop our more able young people to be scarcely more than outstanding hewers of wood and drawers of water and tenders of machines, for production, transportation, exchange.

It may be asked to what disciplines students of superior ability should be submitted in order to develop them for interpretative leadership. That such a question should be asked as frequently as it is indicates the extent to which contemporary education has lost touch with the agelong human tradition, for the studies which conduce to the desired result are well known, or ought to be, to any serious student of educational endeavor down the centuries.

First of all, the potential leader in understanding needs to be trained to think clearly so that, freed from wishfulness, he can distinguish between opinion and fact and relate facts accurately to one another. He

must know his ABC's. He should in his earlier years have been grounded, as has been already said, in the elements of language, his own language at least, in mathematics, and in sensory observation. This three-fold preparatory training, alas, most of them have not received.

An analysis made of entering freshmen at one of our more reputable state universities in 1947 revealed that slightly under 40 per cent of them had had no mathematics at all beyond arithmetic—and not too much of that; that a third of them had never studied grammar, either English grammar or that of any other language; that less than half of them could spell with a competence greater than might be expected of a twelve-year-old child; that four out of ten could not read quickly or accurately or write a paragraph of prose which had unity, coherence, and emphasis.* They were high-school graduates from within the state, and so the incredibly stupid law required the university to jam them into an overcrowded and understaffed student body; but the faculty knew well enough that they could never be educated. This did not bother the intruders. They were there not to be educated but rather to learn a few tricks which might improve their social status and to acquire the B.A. (or B.Phil. or B.Litt. or B.Sc.) as an open sesame to a more lucrative and easier job

* These figures were given to me by the dean, who made me promise not to use his name or identify his university, he did not dare run the risk of it for fear of reprisals by his state Department of Education.

than their fathers and mothers had. It did not bother most of the instructional and administrative staff, for that matter, who either were themselves the diffuse product of a diluted higher education or else looked on the whole thing as a racket by virtue of which they and their families were lodged and fed; but it did trouble to the heart the quite numerous men and women on the faculty who were honest lovers of learning and of their country.

Some of the privately endowed colleges are more careful in those they admit and retain; but they are in competition with the state-supported universities and subject, also, to those social and pedagogical pressures which ignore the necessity of a sound basic training in the schools. They must take what is sent up to them by the secondary schools, which mostly means the public high schools. If they are too particular in their selection, their halls will soon be half empty, and their income from fees will fall off dangerously. This latter is the more to be dreaded because endowment funds nowadays bring in less and less money. Most of the private colleges, therefore, accept and retain and graduate a vast amount of low-grade human material. I was at a meeting of college presidents not long ago, over two hundred of them. "Will each of you who has in his institution a freshman class as many as half of whom are in your opinion intelligent college material, please stand up?" No one did. When the fraction was reduced to one-third, some stood. Only when it was reduced to one-fourth were

most of them on their feet. They knew, they deplored; but what could they do about it?

If the training proper to grammar school and high school has not been given before college matriculation, it must be given, at least to the members of the intellectual elite, after they have arrived on campus. This is difficult and time-consuming, but it must be done. Before the student who is to be developed for discriminating leadership can profit by other disciplines he or she must have learned—I hope the reiteration is not getting tiresome—how competently and accurately to read, write, speak, figure, and observe. This is a first necessity for the education of those who would be more than mechanicals—and even the mechanicals would profit by it.

The first of the disciplines that has properly to do with *higher* education of the potentially intelligent should also have been begun, but in America almost never is, before college days. In a properly organized educational system the student capable of becoming a discriminating leader should have been discovered by the age of fourteen or fifteen and by the time he or she became a candidate for the bachelor's degree (in this country usually about eighteen), he or she should have been vigorously put through the equivalent of the venerable and valuable liberal-arts curriculum.* This was and still is a sevenfold discipline, consisting

* It should be noted that the study of the liberal arts does not necessarily involve a training in the classical languages. The medieval university, where the liberal arts came of age, taught neither Latin nor Greek. No

of the verbal trivium: grammar, rhetoric, logic; and the mathematical quadrivium: arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. Such training is essential to sound thinking. If the Liberal Arts have not been looked after in the secondary school, then the college must take this job on.

It is of equal importance that the would-be interpretative leader should study from as early an age as possible and certainly all through college everything he can lay hands on which throws light on man and his behavior—and this not the social sciences only, which usually deal with what environment does to man rather than with what man can do to and through environment, nor psychology only, for to dissect man's mental goings on is not all there is to understanding man. He should study history, political and cultural; biography; literature, especially poetry, in which man reveals himself more fully than in prose; the fine arts; philosophy, especially epistemology and ethics. From such studies as these he can learn something, if he will, not merely about the pathetic failures of man in the past and now, which knowledge breeds compassion, but also about the great successes that occasionally appear among the ruck of humanity, which knowledge rouses emulation. From such studies he can learn, if he will, how to live without scorn in the midst of pettiness. One who is trained in humane studies is the better fitted not merely to be—

one during the Middle Ages bothered much with Greek, and Latin was merely the common speech of literate Europe.

come a human being but also to become a wise leader of human beings.

It is also important that the interpretative leader should be trained in religion, for if he does not come to know his obligation to that which is greater than himself or any man or all men, his very superiority in native endowment and education is almost certain to engender in him *ὑβρις*, that combination of pride, insolence, effrontery. In this case he may become and remain a leader indeed, but a leader who ruins both himself and those who trust him; knowledge then serves only to implement madness. The only effective way to keep genius from going astray is for it to know and adore the Infinitely Great. (More on this is reserved for a later chapter).

The liberal arts plus humanistic studies plus religion, that is a proper discipline for the potentially intelligent. Nothing else can take its place. A contemplation of the curriculums by which American higher education is today trying to equip men and women for discrimination is bound for the most part to make one exclaim, with Artemus Ward, "How *kurus!*"

Such a threefold course of study characterized American collegiate education in the days when it devoted itself to the production of men who understood basic considerations, the days before it went in for a combination of technical specialization and culture spread very thin. There is an interesting report of the faculty of Yale College in 1829 which bears re-reading and pondering. Even that early, pressure was

beginning to be brought to bear on the colleges to turn toward "practical studies." The faculty said on this occasion:

From different quarters we have heard the suggestion that our colleges must be *new modelled*; that they are not adapted to the spirit and wants of the age, that they will soon be deserted, unless they are better accommodated to the business character of the nation.

The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture are the *discipline* and the *furniture* of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge. The former of these is, perhaps, the more important of the two. A commanding object, therefore, in a collegiate course, should be to call into daily and vigorous exercise the faculties of the student. Those branches of study should be prescribed and those methods of instruction adopted which are best calculated to teach the art of fixing the attention, directing the train of thought, analyzing a subject proposed for investigation; following with accurate discrimination the course of argument; balancing nicely the evidence presented to the judgment; awakening, elevating, and controlling the imagination; arranging with skill the treasures which memory gathers; rousing and guiding the powers of genius. All this is not to be effected by a light and hasty course of study; by reading a few books, hearing a few lectures, and spending some months at a literary institution. The habits of thinking are to be formed by long-continued and close application. If a dexterous performance of the manual operations, in many of the mechanical arts, requires an apprenticeship, with diligent attention for years; much more does the training of the powers of the mind demand vigorous and steady and systematic effort.

From the pure mathematics, he [the student] learns the art of demonstrative reasoning. In attending to the physical

sciences, he becomes familiar with facts, with the process of induction, and the varieties of probable evidence. In ancient literature, he finds some of the most finished models of taste. By English reading, he learns the powers of the language in which he is taught to speak and write. By logic and mental philosophy he is taught the art of thinking; by rhetoric and oratory the art of speaking. By frequent exercise on written composition he acquires copiousness and accuracy of expression. By extemporaneous discussion he becomes prompt and fluent and animated. . . . Our course, therefore, aims at a union of science with literature; of solid attainment with skill in the art of persuasion.

All this is only another way of describing the liberal arts plus humanistic knowledge. Dr. Van Evera of George Washington University, commenting on these resolutions of the Yale faculty of 120 years ago, justly comments:

The liberal-arts curriculum started as a fixed program, very rigorous, to which all students were subjected, and turned out men who used beautiful English naturally, who had a great depth of knowledge, and who were quite practical in their approach to the problems of life. Our educational system has come a long way since that committee of Yale College made its report. While many more are going to college it is doubtful whether the quality of education is holding up. . . . We are a people who like to delude ourselves. Our ancestors built false fronts on their stores in the frontier towns. . . . We like to look like what we wish we were rather than realistically at what we are. It is a tendency which, in the field of education, is to be combated forever.*

* In an article on "Chemistry and Liberal Education" in the *Chemical and Engineering News*, February 16, 1948 Professor A C Krause, M.D., of the University of Chicago, called this article to my attention.

If and when we get around once more to preparing suitably selected people for discriminating leadership, in what fields are they to function? Not, with rare exceptions, in the academic cloister, where genius is apt to flatter genius or else to stab it in the back, but rather in the active life of the world at large, as brothers of the Common Man—but wiser brothers. The liberally educated man can and must earn a living; but merely to do so will not be enough to satisfy him. The true goals of life, toward the pursuit of which the Common Man must somehow be led by the Uncommon Man, are these: a contemplation of greatness and an imitation of it; a seeking of truth and beauty and goodness for their own sake, without care for any other reward than is intrinsic in truth and beauty and goodness; becoming rather than doing. The interpretative leader must strive to live for these goals, in fields of labor by head or hand, in terms of factory or office or farm or home or transportation or the laboratory or the study or the arts or journalism or government or, in a few instances, schools and universities. Only when he has first lived so himself can he persuade other men to live in a similar fashion.

It is encouraging to find that efforts are being made here and there to secure a more adequate education for discrimination. Worth notice, for example, are the somewhat revolutionary reforms at the University of Chicago. The College there takes only extra-bright boys and girls, removes them from stultifying high

schools at the age of fifteen or sixteen, when they normally would have two more years to loaf and fritter away. It has devised a curriculum which stresses the first two requisites that we have noted, namely, an equivalent of the trivium and the quadrivium and a large measure of scientific, historical, literary, and philosophical examination of man, his history and his nature. The third element, religion, is still conspicuously and unfortunately neglected. A new sort of work for the doctorate, too, has been devised at Chicago, by the somewhat ineptly named Committee on Social Thought, which cuts humanistically straight across departmental barriers. Then there are the too timid but nevertheless real reforms involved in the new plans at Columbia and Harvard and Yale and their even more timid, but still significant, imitations in scores of less known places. There are attempts to secure excellence, revolutionary though sometimes eccentric, at a few brave little colleges, notably St. John's at Annapolis. More noteworthy still is the higher education promoted by the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans, who, to a much greater extent than most of their Protestant brethren, have refused to abandon the tried and tested disciplines of learning. At least they have not done so in theory, though it must be admitted that the pressure on them of American educational mistakes and of the materialism of student demand is sometimes so great that their performance does not wholly live up to their profession.

All these things are to the good. Nevertheless, it remains true that the American higher educational machine for the most part still pursues its ponderous cultivation of a utilitarian mediocrity which, though it calls itself "democratic," is a large factor, perhaps the largest factor, in making democracy unworkable.

6. The Home and Education

ONE of the chief hindrances to decent education in America today is our overloading of the schools by placing on their shoulders responsibilities which in other times and other countries have as a matter of course been assumed by the home.

For this overloading, those in charge of the schools are at least partly to blame. They have been only too ready to assume and often to claim that they should look after the total development of growing boys and girls and that they can do a better job with and for them than their own fathers and mothers. Schoolmen have not been content with their former function, one largely of instruction; they have desired to deal with the whole child: his health and hygiene, his games and sports, his social growth, his manners and morals, the rounded development of his character. This assumption is plainly visible, for example, in the activities of most Parent-Teacher Associations, the growth of which has been rapid of late years. These are usually directed, though not usually officered, by the school people and not by the parents; and their purpose, sometimes veiled and sometimes overt, seems to be to show the parents how to help the school,

almost never the other way about.* Never in history, except in a few totalitarian regimes like that of ancient Sparta, has so great a claim been made by pedagogues. Until recently they have been quite content to be the helpers of parents, giving such formal instruction to boys and girls as was needed and asked for. They have not in the least desired to be placed *in loco parentis*. But nowadays the schools too often accept, ask for, demand that they be given tasks, always hitherto domestic and properly domestic, which they are not able to perform and never will be able to perform.

For schools successfully to assume the whole charge of a growing generation would involve, would compel the expenditure of sums of money more vast than is economically defensible. First of all, the type of

* In their admirable and widely used textbook, *The American Educational System* (Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1940), Professors John Dale Russell and Charles H. Judd of the School of Education at the University of Chicago express what is the attitude of most public-school administrators toward parent-teacher associations "As a rule parents wish only the best of school conditions for their children, determination of what is best . . . is not, however, a matter for parents to decide, but is the responsibility of the regularly constituted school authorities. . . . It is all too easy for parents, particularly when organized in an association, to get the idea that schools are conducted for their especial benefit . . . An organization of this type performs a useful service in *acquainting parents with the plans, policies and procedures of the school*" (The italics are mine) The authors go on to suggest that if the parents do not like a public school they can remove their children from that school and place them "where conditions are more to their liking." It is perhaps needless to point out the arrogance of such an attitude toward parents; in nine-tenths of the country there are no schools other than public schools to which the parents may send their children, no matter how great their possibly legitimate dissatisfaction.

school building would have to be very different indeed from what it normally is now, much more elaborate, vastly more expensive than even the best of our present public-school edifices. There would need to be not only classrooms but directed playrooms and playgrounds, supervised shops for the development of crafts and hobbies, clinical facilities for doctors and psychiatrists. Secondly, many more teachers would be required. One instructor to twenty pupils would be the minimum staff thinkable, instead of the one to thirty-five or even fifty pupils which we generally provide. All these teachers, too, would need to be expertly trained in hygiene, physical and mental, social techniques, skill in making personality analyses and in giving remedial care, far more so than the best of parents, because the teacher cannot depend, as parents should and do depend, upon filial affection to reveal hidden difficulties that arise. Therefore we should need at least twice as many teachers for the same number of pupils as we now have, and teachers trained for twice the present number of years in professional subjects. Our instructional expense per child would be at least doubled, maybe tripled. Where are these teachers to be found? We cannot get enough even of the present quality to carry on. Moreover, the type of work would be such that many, possibly most, of our present staff would not qualify for it; in a system designed for adequate total care only persons much more gifted would do.

Anyone who listens to current school pretensions

and who knows the facts about current school equipment and personnel and financial resources is bound to conclude that American education has for a long time been biting off more than it can chew. Parents, the public generally, have assumed that it could do and was doing what it pretended to be doing. The results of this are bad. Boys and girls have little or no time in the schools for a thorough mastery of the old-fashioned school subjects, because overworked instructors are fooling around with attempts to integrate the characters of the poor little devils and nurse them into social and spiritual maturity—and failing at that too. The parents, lulled into a false sense of security, have largely abdicated; the schools cannot take over; the progeny is not much fun to look at. Because it is undisciplined it becomes irritable, unruly, unhappy, often a general nuisance, sometimes definitely antisocial, too frequently criminal.

While the blame for this tragicomic state of affairs is, as has been said, partly chargeable to the unrealistic pretensions of school administrators (school-of-education professors aiding and abetting), who are understandably though unforgivably anxious to overmagnify their office, it must be remembered in all justice that the major share of responsibility lies with American parents. More and more parents have shown themselves only too ready to farm out their children to the schools rather than continue the difficult and exacting job of bringing up the youngsters whom they have begotten and born. More and more have

tended to forget that responsibility for the stability of society rests upon the home, upon the home not as a place in which to eat and sleep and throw a party once in a while but the home as an educational institution.

The first social unit was a father and mother and some children, the former responsible for humanizing the latter, teaching them how to behave, civilizing them, maturing them. Long before there were clans, tribes, nations, there were families; and when larger units developed they were associations of families. The strength of these larger units depended upon the contributing strength of the families *qua* families. The family was the first social unit; the family remains and always will remain the basic social unit. It has been true down the ages and it is still true that when fathers and mothers cease to bring up their own children properly society begins to fall to pieces.

This is the way of nature as a whole. Among dogs and ducks and horses those who bring progeny into the world have always taught that progeny how to behave as decent dogs or ducks or horses should. Observe a cat with her kittens. She trains them by example, she smacks them when they do not behave cat-wise, she rewards them when they do, finally she manages to develop them into functioning cats. Even so it is the way of nature that the fundamental and indispensable business of the human mother, with more help from her spouse than the cat mother ever gets, is the training of her children to function

humanwise. It is the job of the parents to show their boys and girls how to live and what to live for. If necessary they must sacrifice all their other activity to it. This business cannot be delegated effectively; any other method of maturing children is artificial and relatively ineffective. To let the schools try to take the job over and expect them to succeed at it is quite unreasonable.

Just what are parents to teach? They are responsible for teaching, with such aid as they may get from school and church, three things which only they can teach well, things which children must master if society is to function soundly, even if it is to continue, things which children must know if character is to develop. The first of these is good manners, how to get along with other people with a minimum of friction caused by self-assertiveness. The second is morals. These are more than manners. Manners have to do with how to live with others, while morals are concerned with how to live also with oneself, how to live for such ends as will satisfy the yearning for happiness and deliver one from a sense of frustration. Morals have to do incidentally with living with others, to be sure, and so they involve manners; but morals go deeper than manners. The third thing is religion, which involves how to live with the Oneness of Things, with Totality of Purpose, in short, with God.

It is important that manners, morals, and religion should be taught well, for they are the most socially vital of all the things that a child must learn. Unless

we know as a people how to get along with one another peaceably, harmoniously, with mutual consideration and tolerance; unless we learn, quite as a matter of course, how human beings must live if they are to acquire a sense of significance and self-respect; unless we discover and live by, again quite as a matter of course, man's true relationship to the totality of things, to God, to the Ultimate whose purpose sustains the universe—unless we do these things, which can be taught nowhere so easily or so competently as by parents to their own offspring, our civilization will continue to disintegrate. Manners, morals, religion * have always been taught by parents in the home; to teach them otherwise is to teach them awkwardly and badly. Because they are the indispensable disciplines which make for character, in which human beings must become and remain reasonably adept, and because such is the function of the home, parents cannot abdicate the authority and responsibility to teach them except at the cost of contributing to social disruption.

Are the homes of America handling this, their educational business, in a competent manner? Less and less so with every passing year.

Parents of today who try to carry on or resume their educational labors find it increasingly difficult to do what they know is their duty, because our present

* To the third of these, the most subtle and most important of the three (because the other two greatly depend upon it), to religion and how it may be taught in the home I have devoted a later chapter in this book.

society has "set" in a pattern which makes a home in any true sense of the word less and less possible to maintain. Realizing this, consciously or subconsciously, many parents listen entranced to the siren voice of the total educator. They know that they cannot, if they will, take proper care of the character development of their young ones at home, and they hope against hope that the schools may succeed where they, through circumstances largely beyond their control, seem almost sure to fail. Instead of looking for a substitute for the home, they would do better to demand such radical changes in our social structure as would again make the home possible. There is—be it repeated—no substitute for the home as chief teacher of character. But it is bitterly hard to reform a society gone haywire; it is easier to rely on the schools. It is easy to damn the schools, too, as is quite too commonly done, when we face an inevitable juvenile delinquency: "One half our crimes are committed by children under sixteen," "Our children act like hoodlums, destructive, utterly inconsiderate," "Premarital sexuality grows among our boys and girls." It is folly for parents or for the general public to expect the schools to overcome basic cultural maladjustments which are beyond the homes to overcome. One must out of compassion pity American parents as much as one blames them, for the American home, in terms of which parents have to educate their young, is becoming obsolescent.

What are some of the reasons why the home is dis-

appearing among us or, if not quite that, at least is being so changed that parents can no longer educate their children in terms of it with reasonable competency?

In the first place, more and more families have housing facilities insufficient in size and of a kind which make proper child rearing difficult, in many instances impossible. This is especially true in the great centers of population. It is safe to make the generalization that the larger the metropolis the worse the family fares. What chance is there for ordinary relationships, maturing fellowships, between parents and children in Greater New York, for instance—on Manhattan Island, in the Bronx, in most of Queens, or Brooklyn? Families in New York live in quarters for the most part too constricted for such normal joys.

Even on Park Avenue there are few apartments big enough for children to have rooms of their own in which they may live and move and have their being during the day and in which to entertain their parents. In few of them is it possible to have a workshop or a rumpus room, or even a living room that is adapted for general family conversation. And, of course, Park Avenue youngsters have no dirt to dig in, no outdoor life except in Central Park. One cannot wonder that most of them are packed off to boarding school at the age of twelve or thirteen. Parents who can afford the steep fees required gladly emancipate their youngsters as soon as they can from the

cramped quarters and free themselves, incidentally, from such cheek-by-jowl crowding against their boys and girls as makes mutually tolerant friendship with them next to impossible.

If this is true on the Gold Coast, what are we to say of family life in Hell's Kitchen or on the lower East Side or in the Village, not to speak of that unspeakable reproach to Gotham which is Harlem? What are fathers and mothers to do if they and their young are condemned to live in two or three or four small rooms in a huddled tenement house, even in one of those newer sanitary slums known as "housing projects"? One cannot blame people forced to live in such fashion for having as few children as possible, maybe none at all. If they do have two or three, which is the smallest number that is desirable if the children are to help educate each other, what is to be done with them? They needs must be pushed out of the home most of the time, usually to run the streets, sometimes to go to a church or settlement house or playground. Whether their place of refuge be uplifting or degrading, at least they will not, physically cannot stay at home and pal about with father and mother. It is small wonder that our juvenile delinquency is increasing. It is only by tremendous parental labor, against almost insuperable odds, and by the grace of God that there is not a great deal more of it.

I live on the edge of Jackson Park in Chicago. To that beautiful area come vast numbers of people, by streetcar and bus and on foot, from the drab congested

neighborhoods: hordes of children of many racial stocks and of at least three colors—white, black, and yellow—young Americans all. They are a distressing lot. Too frequently they are little more than ill-mannered young hooligans. They litter the place, they pull the flowers, they break the trees and bushes, they shove and fight, they yell. Not long ago some of them burned to the ground, just for the fun of it, the charming Japanese tea house on the Wooded Island, which was built for the World's Fair in 1892, one of the loveliest things in our city.*

I cannot find it in my heart to put the whole blame, or even the larger part of it, for what the children are, on the shoulders of their fathers and mothers. These good people live in housing which makes the maintenance of real homes too difficult. In consequence they have lost their children, who are everywhere except with their own parents, everywhere except at home. The small fry will not and cannot stay under the parental eye, they have to get out and blow off steam. When the boys and girls are older and begin to be interested across sex lines they have no proper place in which to court; they court in the streets, in the parks, sometimes in taverns, almost anywhere except where their fathers and mothers may be friends and advisers and givers of benediction to the mating couples.

* It is characteristic of Chicago that nothing is being done to rebuild this charming structure.

Not 5 per cent of the domiciles in New York City or in Chicago or in any other major American city are fit for the bringing up of children. The larger the city, the more this is true. The lesser cities are better fitted for families than the bigger ones; the small towns are better off still. But more and more we are becoming a megalopolitan people. It is increasingly hard for parents who must live in cities to look after the character education of their young. That is why conscientious parents move to the suburbs if they possibly can afford it; for most people it is financially out of the question. But suburban life is not too good either, for, except in the case of a few high-placed executives, the suburbanite must spend so much time going to and from his distant work that a great part of the time he is exiled from his young ones. They are at home, but he is not.

Nor is our way of living conducive to an educative sharing of labor between parents and children. The only means by which we come really to know and appreciate one another is mutual participation in creative activity. This is a truism in human relationships, especially applicable to the development and maintenance of friendship between older people and younger, between the generations. There was a time—it is not very long ago, either—when in the home there was mutual work and its fruit in comradeships.

Consider, for instance, the Gilley family on the Maine coast near Bar Harbor a century ago, as de-

scribed by President Eliot of Harvard in his delightful essay on John Gilley.* What a life of mutual and educative activity was led by John's parents, his nine brothers and sisters, and himself! The girls by the time they were twelve years old were coworkers with the mother. They tended the poultry, made butter, spun wool. The boys toiled side by side with their father. Unaided except by these lads, he cleared the island, broke up the cleared land, hauled off part of the stones, piled them into walls, made fields for grass and other crops. The family often dug two or three hundred bushels of potatoes in a season. There were spinning wheels and looms. The wool of at least fifty sheep was used every year in the household. Nor was it all work. In the long winter evenings they played checkers together or fox and geese. The mother read to the family until the children grew old enough to take their share in reading aloud. Shared work and shared recreation brought parents and children into unity and enabled the parents to give their boys and girls such character guidance as they needed for maturity. No wonder the Gilleys turned out to be persons of worth when they grew up or that, as Dr. Eliot says, "the survivors of that isolated family look back on their childhood as a happy one; and they feel a strong sense of obligation to the father and mother." Not all homes in America a hundred years ago had such Spartan simplicity, but in most of them there

* This essay was charmingly reprinted in 1947 by the Idlewild Press, Cornwall-on-Hudson, New York.

was a delegation to boys and girls of real and important duties, in the performance of which family life became a reality and a microcosm of the larger community.

From their elders children learned to be craftsmen. I was talking not long ago with a parent in New York, a very well-off man financially, who felt, I think rightly, that it was a disgrace to himself and to his wife that of their three grown daughters none had learned at home how to cook or how to make her own clothes or how to repair them or how to make beds or even how to pick up discarded garments. "The thing that I object to is not that I can't afford to hire servants to do these things for them, for of course I can, and they will probably marry men who will continue to give them such assistance. What is wrong is that these girls of mine have not learned in my house the joy of craftsmanship in homeworking and that in consequence they do not really know either their mother or me. We have not been able to teach them what we desired because they have been strangers to us. They would have turned out to be much finer women if they had known their mother as only fellow workers can know one another, and they might even have learned a few things from their father."

In the homes that made America a strong and happy nation there were many things to be done. There was fuel to cut; as soon as a youngster was able to handle a little ax he helped to chop wood and carry it in and pile it up in the cellar or the woodhouse. He lent a

hand cutting ice in the winter and clearing away the snow. He assisted in the cultivation of the garden and in the care of the household animals. There was cooking to be done and cleaning and mending. Father and mother and children cooperating, the family came to know and respect and love one another in an educative fashion. That sort of thing has today become artificial and dispensable. Where to keep cows and pigs and chickens if one wants them? Why keep them if butchering is more economical when mass-handled and milk is something that comes in a sanitary bottle and eggs are done up in neat cartons? Where can one have a garden in Megalopolis? Automatic devices do most of the housework. Gone from the home are those crafts the sharing of which was the best part of family life and the most effective device for character development. Children no longer feel that the home is *their* home, that they are contributing or can contribute anything much to its support and welfare.

Nor is it usual for the home to be any longer a scene of shared fun. How much amusement goes on nowadays in the family habitat? Some of us who are fifty, when we recall our childhood, realize that almost all the merriment we had—and we had a great deal of merriment—was home-made and home-centered. We had our friends in, or they had us in. There were parties, games, popcorn, and cider in the winter, cold drinks of a harmless nature in the summer, informal dancing parties in our houses even

when those houses were not very big, picnics toward which several friendly households would cooperate, all sorts of activities in which we and our parents together had the time of our lives. We even enjoyed listening, sometimes with pride and at other times skeptically, to our elders as we all sat on the porch or in the garden or around the fireplace when it was cold.

No longer is this possible or at least easy. If a mid-twentieth-century parent wishes to provide amusement for his young, what does he do? The first thing he thinks of is to pack them off to the movies. Whatever may be the merits or the faults of the current cinema, at least it is not something that is home-centered. Soon to the child's mind the motion-picture theater becomes the amusement center; again his loyalty to his father and mother, his normal dependence on them, is undermined. It is one thing to play with your parents and quite another thing to have them buy you some tickets—or even go and sit silently beside you—and bid you watch a picture. Once more one must not blame the parents too much, for an overcrowded flat is no place in which to play.

Again, it is not merely the children who do not stay at home but also the parents. Why are they not there? Frequently because they cannot be. Often the father and the mother both have to seek paid employment in order to keep the family going at all. Sometimes both parents work at the same time. Maybe one works during the day and the other at night. They

may prefer this because then there is always "somebody at home with the children"; but it is usually a tired and lonely parent who is at home with them, and the children find small nurture from such a parent, nor do they gain much sense of security if they rarely see both their parents at any one time.

Even when working parents are at home, they are frequently too exhausted to welcome having small ones under foot. This is apt to be as true nowadays of the working mother as it is of the working father. The male parent arrives in the evening all tuckered out, with nothing left to give the boys and girls. He putters about a little, smokes his pipe, nods over the paper, runs the radio, only half listening to it, goes to bed if he does not step out for a bit. The working mother does pretty much the same. "Here, children, is some money; run along and find some fun. Daddy and mother are tired."

Sometimes we do not realize, either, the disintegrating effect upon family solidarity and therefore upon character education of two of the most popularly prized inventions of the last half century, the wireless and the motor car. The former has well nigh ruined the custom of reading aloud at home and has seriously interfered with family conversation. The latter has spread the roving wings of the young. As President Virgil Hancher of the State University of Iowa has pointed out:

• "Christianity in an Age of Power," University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, Iowa, 1947.

Under the impact [of increased speed in transportation] old customs disappear, and new ones do not have time to become established. Fifty years ago young people would ordinarily spend a Sunday in their own community. Today it is possible for them by using automobiles to go to points a hundred or two hundred miles distant from their homes, and by using aeroplanes they can go far greater distances. The acceleration of travel, the development of the radio, the staccato tempo of modern life have had far-reaching effects upon the home, the school, and the church.

This is indeed true. It was once said that the chief trouble with Columbia University is that Broadway and the subway both run right through the center of its campus; the academic community consequently is scattered to the four winds, and normal contacts between professors and students, students and students, scholars and scholars are rendered almost impossible. Nowadays the motor roads have brought about a similar disintegration in almost every college, not to speak of the high schools. The home has suffered quite as much. Nearly every family has an automobile, even families which go in for almost no other luxury. Indeed, this is often no longer a luxury, but a necessity for getting to and from work. The car is not quite so omnipresent in the metropolis, where garaging is expensive and where other means of rapid transit are easily available; but today it is a rare home in any American smaller city or town or farmstead which does not have a jalopy of some sort ready for instant use. The young people demand and get the use of it for frequent jaunts on their own.

It takes them away from the home and parents. Also, the restlessness induced by constant motion makes being quiet and relaxed at any time unwelcome—to elders as well as to youngsters. We are all of us speed-stimulated. "Let's get going. Where? Oh, anywhere." One recalls Clarence Day's remark,* that our being descended from monkeys is plainly demonstrated by man's tendency in times of cultural retrogression like ours never to stay at home.

There is no chance, of course, of going back to the horse-and-buggy era, the era of the music box and the parlor organ, and few of us would wish to do so even if we could. But we should at least recognize that in former times life with father was a great deal easier, more rewarding, more educative than it is in these later, noisier, more centrifugal days.

Last but by no means least, there is small use in denying that the chief enemy of the American home is the increasing selfishness of the American adult. Our way of life, which bids people live for possessions, comforts, luxuries, ease, amusements as the chief ends of man, makes for ineffective parents and keeps children from enjoying easy and normal training in character.

It tends to produce, in the first place, that anti-social anomaly, the childless home. There was a time not long back when, if a man and wife had no children, it was supposed by their friends and neighbors

* Clarence Day, Jr., *This Simian World*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York, 1920

as a matter of course that they could have none; they were pitied for their misfortune; they deemed themselves afflicted. Things have changed. Today many homes are childless by deliberate choice. Potential fathers and mothers wish to be without sons and daughters and use mechanical means to prevent conception; and, if conception does result, they often resort to child murder rather than let the babies come to birth. The already ghastly number of abortions grows apace; doctors estimate, for instance, that for every child born in the better-off parts of New York City there is one child killed before it is born. Abortion and prevention of conception are more prevalent among the privileged groups, sections of the community presumably most competent to rear children properly and best able to care for them economically. Forty-five per cent of women with a college degree fail to reproduce themselves and their husbands; they remain unwed, or if they marry they have one child or none.

Why childless marriages, abnormal marriages? In only a few of them is inability to breed the real cause. The man or his wife or both of them are lazy and self-pampering; they do not wish to have their adult priority in the household interfered with by little nuisances running about. There are times when birth control may be advisable, but certainly the extent to which contraception is used in America at the moment is traitorous. It is also sinful in the eyes of every major religion of the world, though some easy-

going modern sects have of late begun to condone it.

Of course those who deliberately do not have enough children are not always entirely selfish; sometimes they are regretfully prudent. They think it necessary not to have three or four descendants because they are sure that if they do they will deprive the one or two they now possess of proper opportunities and advantages. Sometimes the excuse is a valid one. Our society is in many ways so grossly maladjusted that the plea is not unreasonable in every case; but commonly it is a fraudulent and self-deluding plea; what they fear is that not only the children they have but also they themselves may be deprived of luxuries rather than necessities.

The selfishness of more and more of our contemporary parents also manifests itself in neglect of children. Parents all too often pity themselves, run away from their plain duty, their chief job, their greatest avenue to the respect of God and of honest men. They place their own welfare, even their amusements ahead of the well-being of their sons and daughters. They may, and usually do, see that the boys and girls are clothed, fed, washed, have their teeth attended to; but to make pals of them, to live with them, to laugh and cry and work and play with them, lovingly but firmly to discipline them, this takes too much time and effort altogether. The American parent tends increasingly to pamper himself or herself. In consequence little is taught to the children by precept and

less by example. Then the parents dump their progeny at the feet of the schoolmaster and schoolmistress and say, "Here, we have no time to bring these youngsters up, nor have we any stomach for the job. You take them over, as totally as possible, and do what we will not do for our own. Train them in character; that is what you get paid for."

Schoolmen would be more wise, more honest than they usually are, if they said in reply to taxpayers, to the community, above all to parents, "We refuse to take on ourselves responsibility for the character development of your children. We shall do our bit by them, but you must give them the more important part of that training in your own homes. If because of community maladjustments you can no longer do this, then rectify the social wrongs; do not push off the malformed and stunted youngsters on us and then blame us for their deficiencies. If you can do your job and will not, let the responsibility for what your boys and girls turn out to be rest where it belongs—on your own heads, not on ours. If, as seems not unlikely, our civilization comes to ruin because the oncoming generation lacks character, that will be too bad; but if it happens, know this: *we will not take the blame.*" Instead, partly because many school people are puffed up with a sense of imagined omnipotence and partly because, even when they know that they cannot do their own difficult work plus the work of parents, they have pity on poor, home-neglected little tikes, they tend more and more to be obedient to the demands

of incompetent fathers and mothers and try their best to take care of the spiritual foundlings. This is noble of those in the schools; it is also stupid of them. From their softhearted foolishness all suffer: the children, the increasingly heedless progenitors, the pedagogues themselves who fail and are berated for it, the commonwealth generally.*

* "Education cannot do everything. It cannot do everything equally well. It cannot do some things as well as other social institutions can do them or could do them if these institutions were forced to discharge their responsibilities instead of leaving the educational system to struggle along with them by default." Robert M. Hutchins, *The Educational Record*, April, 1948, p. 115.

7. Experience And Education

KNOWLEDGE consists of experience digested by reason. Reason arranges in some sort of order what has been encountered and observed, either directly or by an imaginative sharing of the experience of others. Education consists, therefore, not only in the training of the reason logically and competently to function but also in the securing of as large and profound and balanced an experience as possible.* There are five varieties of human experience, and none of them can be neglected in education.

The first type of experience † consists of *direct ap-*

* *Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu* It does not follow from this, as Locke and others seem to have thought and as many contemporary scientificists assume, that Reality consists only in what experience reveals; all that necessarily follows is that man's *approach to an understanding of Reality* is by way of digested experience. It is entirely possible to maintain this and still to know that Reality is independent of man and antecedent to him, that it is of God. As St. John writes in that preface to his Gospel in which Jewish religion and Greek philosophy meet, "In the beginning was the Word [Logos, the Utter and Creative Reality] and the Word was with God and the Word was God." He goes on to say that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us", only when translated into terms of human experience could—or can—Reality become known to man. Because man's experience is hampered by innate limitations, because even at his most vivid and adequate he only a little apprehends and never comprehends, man's knowledge is and must remain only a glimpsing of Truth.

† It is "first" not in time, for all types begin together at birth or before

prehension of nature, nature in all its charm and intricate variety. This is not the same thing as scientific experience, to which it bears much the same relationship that poetry bears to literary criticism or that religion bears to theology. Just as one may be a critic of poetry and yet have no appreciation of poetry and sometimes by one's action toward a poem reduce the poem itself into insignificance, just as one may be acute in theology without coming within hailing distance of religion, even so one may be no end of a scientist and yet altogether miss the significance of nature, nature as something to be respected and loved. This first sort of experience embraces the totality of things natural, approached with acceptance rather than analysis.

Experience of this first kind helps to induce such a sense of inner unity with that which is as results in humility, admiration, serenity even in the midst of conflict. It affects for good both manners and morals. It is a source of great poetry, music, drama. It also performs more humble services. It is the sort of thing that reveals itself in such a book as Thoreau's *Walden*. It is easiest attained by those who live in pastoral surroundings; but to know nature in this total and accepting sense is possible not only in the countryside but even in a crowded city. To be sure, metropolitan life gives us fewer of nature's invaluable revelations about the meaning of the universe and of man within

birth, "first" not in importance either, for all five are equally necessary and valuable; "first" only because one must begin somewhere.

that universe. In great cities a nurturing contemplation of the whole of things is hindered by the necessity of observing also the disorderly confusion introduced by man. A city street is beautiful, to be respected and loved, but only when it is swept of litter and freed from decaying motor cars, parked and forlorn. A row of houses or flats is worth respect for its own sake but only when taken care of, much as food and drink can be revered only when properly cooked and decently served. Nevertheless, whether in God's own country or in a man-defaced city, things as things should receive, because they are entitled to it, respect and love. They are to be enjoyed with gratitude not only to the Giver but also to what He gives. To bestow upon nature this love, this gratitude, is not only a moral duty, it is an act, an attitude made up of acts, necessary for the physical and mental hygiene of human beings. It balances, stabilizes.

A colleague of mine, head of the Department of Fine Arts at one of our leading universities, once wrote me:

The seasons, the weather are parts of nature and to be respected. I am astonished to find how ill and ungraciously many people nowadays take these manifestations of the sacred order of the world, especially in this country. The Italians are much better at it. Surely one can enjoy the gifts of the seasons, heat and dryness and sleet and rain and snow, without constant grumbling, with appreciation of their place in the round of the year. Under this heading belong, too, such things as pain. I am appalled at the lack in my students and colleagues of sanity about such matters, at their quick sur-

render to all kinds of complaint at simple and natural disturbances.

One may, one must learn to experience nature not merely as an analytical scientist but also as what used to be called, quite accurately, "a naturalist." A growing human being properly should be a naturalist *before* he is encouraged to develop as a scientist. He should learn to accept and value natural objects large and small, simple and complex, before he dares begin to take them to pieces to see how they click.*

How to teach reverence for nature to the youth of America today, especially to those who must live in the larger places, is a difficult thing to figure out. We may be sure, however, that unless we do it somehow and do it well, it will not be wise and wholesome men and women whom we turn out into the world.

The second variety of experience is *scientific experience*. Every man is to some degree a scientist; he

* "The scientific world of pointer readings would be an impossible sort of place to inhabit. It is a symbolic world, and the only thing that could live comfortably in it would be a symbol. But I am not a symbol." A. S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1928.

Henry Margenau, quoting this (*College Reading and Religion*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1948), goes on to point out that to Eddington as to other well-balanced people, there is always not only a *scientific* knowledge of nature but also an *intimate* knowledge thereof, knowledge that will not submit to codification or analysis. A joke, says Eddington, is a fact, but it cannot be scientifically analyzed. And as Arnold E. Bergstrasser once said to me, "If you rely on scientific scholarship alone, or primarily, in examination of a poem, you may get a beautiful piece of research but the poem will have flown out the window." A tree or a mountain or the starry heavens or a fish or what you will, can be, *must* be approached *first* naturalistically and *then* scientifically.

can learn things by using his five senses; he can hear and see and taste and touch and smell, and measure what he sensibly perceives.

The third category of experience is quite different from either of the first two, and it is as necessary as either or both of them if a man would grow competently toward knowing. I can manipulate sound, form, color, words until they do my will, until they embody insights into an order and significance which originate not in them but in me. I can make them carry my vision so clearly that I can convey it to others and intensify it within myself. This is what is known as *creative or artistic experience*.

I can do still another sort of thing: I can discover, appreciate, evaluate, and to a degree understand other persons. The process of perceiving them and coming into some degree of unity with them is a thing difficult to describe, but we all know what it is. Only a little is it dependent upon what the five senses reveal; it is different from sensing the dignity of nature; it has not much to do with creative art. Its name is *mystical experience*.

As far as I know, there is no human experience which does not come under one of the heads just mentioned. I can perceive with my five senses; I can create embodiments of intuitions and ideas; I can know what it means to realize and be at peace with nature; I can discover and react to other persons than myself. At least potentially and to some extent actually every human being is a scientist, a nature valuer,

an artist, a lover, or mystic. As all of these he finds himself more and more in touch with what is external to himself; he is a discoverer; and the more he is thus in touch with Reality the more he understands himself. By means of a manifold experience he reaches out to his world, gropes toward the totality of things. Each kind of experience furnishes him with material that reason may examine, weigh, relate to what previously has been experienced. So knowledge grows.

But it needs to be recognized further that the fourth variety, mystical experience, always has been and is and always will be of two subvarieties: the first, *experience of contingent persons*; the second, *experience of an ultimate Person*, to which has been given the name "religion." Sometimes the humanist thinks that his is the only valid mysticism, that the only contact of person with person which is possible or necessary is contact with men and women. In this he is almost certainly mistaken. On examination a humanist usually turns out to be either one who has degenerated from religion because he has found the search for God too mentally exacting or too emotionally exhausting or else one who has perceived the inadequacy of things but has not had enough practice in living to discover that human companionships are also insufficient. The humanist is not likely to stop at humanism. He is almost sure, if he is intelligent, to gravitate either toward scientific mechanism, negation of purpose, essential hopelessness, or else toward theism.

There are, then, really *five* manners of experience. An adequate education involves developing an increasing expertness in all of them: science, appreciation of the nature of things, creative art, social relationships, religion. If the cultivation of any is neglected, an avenue is closed toward understanding and possible harmony with Reality. Omit any one or leave it in an embryonic state, and the pupil becomes, quite literally, unbalanced.

II

It is worth while, if one would understand contemporary education, to look back a bit into times past and note how the five experimental techniques have been combined, in varying degrees of balance or the lack of it.

In such a survey it is difficult to see in retrospect much farther back than the Greeks, because about education before their day we have not too much data. In education the Greeks combined the creative and the scientific disciplines with a reverence for the things that are, for nature per se, in a harmony never excelled since their time. An Attic youth was helped constantly to regard himself, first of all, as an artist. This influenced not only his painting, sculpture, music, handicrafts, manners in general, but even his athletics. What most people today admire in sports is force, speed, power; what the Hellenes sought was poise, rhythm, grace. Beauty was the mistress and strength the servant. Greek athletics culminated in

the dance. No people has ever had such appreciation of artistic achievement, a more general good taste, a greater ability to shape exquisite objects even for vulgar uses. Equally, the Greeks were devoted to science. Handicapped by their lack of precision instruments, they yet reached scientific discernments surpassed only in very modern times. For at least fifteen hundred years after the period of their greatest vigor, neither in perfection of scientific method nor in volume of observed fact did any people excel them; and only the Arabs came anywhere near to equaling them. The third discipline, experience in human relationships, they also brought to a high degree of cultivation. As for their reverence for things that are, for nature as a whole, no one who has read their literature can doubt it.

The defect in Greek education was that it neglected the cultivation of contact with ultimate Personality. The Greeks in their flowering period were as nearly untheistic as men well can be. Quite early in their history they abandoned any real faith in the gods. Olympus became the habitat of what were scarcely more than personifications of man's own passions or, in the minds of the learned, protagonists of speculative concepts. There remained little religion, in any true sense of that word. The masses retained a crude sort of animistic magic; but magic is not religion, it is religion upside down. It bids men not to serve the Unseen but to make the Unseen serve them. Its assumption is that man is more clever and more power-

ful than his deities. For such crude cults the wiser citizens had an amused tolerance. They and the magic-practicing lower classes were alike in this: they served nothing greater than themselves. The Greek was a contented skeptic—in the end, of course, a by no means contented skeptic but still a skeptic. He was, with a few exceptions, too unimaginative to be aware that there might be something greater than his self-admiring self. He rarely sought communion with the challenging force beyond him, with the hidden strength beneath him. Like every irreligious person, after a while he was more and more weakened by conceit. Hellas became an easy prey to peoples more aspiring, more visionary. The Persians undermined its controls. Rome absorbed the wreckage.

The Romans were a literal-minded, matter-of-fact, highly efficient set of parvenus. Like all newly rich upstarts they bought up the culture of their predecessors and vulgarized it, much as in the twentieth century the newer nations have bought up and vulgarized European culture. The Romans were strong on science, especially applied science. They took over the Aegean culture and its methods of education, including a tolerant indifference toward religion. They were oblivious Philistines. Their arts were for the most part pedestrian and imperceptive. Soon their gods were only variants of the Olympian family and, like the originals, of small relevancy to thought or life. The only cult that mattered in imperial Rome was the worship of the military power of the emperor,

of the State. Roman education starved the human hunger for a truth higher than may be discovered by physical experiment, for beauty beyond human power to create, for goodness that is more than canny benevolence and patriotism, for love of the lovely universe. The Greeks had had science, creative art, social amenities, reverence for that which is, and no religion to speak of. The Romans went in seriously only for applied science; the rest of their culture was imitative.

When Christianity came into this Romanized world, the released enthusiasm for religion that followed was like the rushing of a long-pent flood. Man jumped from one extreme to another. In an absorption in something which had been for too long inwardly desired but denied, Christianity let perish much that was right in classical education. A people which for a great many years had believed only in itself and in the things of the senses became at great speed a people seeking with fanatic interest knowledge of that which is beyond this world. After the Empire had slowly crumbled from within, its disintegration hastened by the barbarian invasions, and after the resulting confusion of Europe had resolved itself at last into the order of the Middle Ages, an educational system emerged fitted for the new emphasis. This education stressed the training of the reason but showed an other-worldly unbalance in respect to the categories of experience. It remained in vogue in

Europe for several hundred years, beginning about the beginning of the eleventh century.

In the Middle Ages educational benefactions were enormous in volume. Great universities were developed, and lower schools too. The Middle Ages were not ignorant or without culture, but they were uncritical of their own educational assumptions and, in consequence, lopsided. The teaching of the period, almost all of it monastic in tradition if not in actual control, made much—proportionately too much—of religious knowledge. Artistic, or creative, experience was not neglected. Rarely have the arts flourished more vitally than among those who painted the primitives, brought the plain chant to perfection, carved Gothic statuary and ornament, raised the great cathedrals. What medieval man neglected was what the Greco-Roman world had most valued, namely, experience of fact. Only rarely have men and women been so little interested in the visible and tangible universe as such, whether as naturalists or as analytical scientists.

The absurdity of this maladjustment did not go unnoticed. It began to attract the attention of leading minds, and possibly there would have been a normal recovery of balance had it not been for the Crusades. By themselves and through their aftermath the Crusades were destined to sidetrack educational rebalance for at least three centuries. They sent great armies of by-no-means unintelligent people from the West into

what is now Greece and the Near East, where much of the literary and artistic treasure of the ancient world had been preserved, together with much of the softness and luxury of the classical age in decadence. The Crusaders brought back home with them, for good and for ill, contacts with the long-ignored remnants of ancient days. This did not result in the introduction into Western culture and education of that nature study and science for lack of which the Middle Ages were growing sterile. Instead, the Crusaders returned with an admiration for the sensuous beauty of times past; a classical scorn for the contemplative disciplines; a disdain of religion; an almost incredibly absurd faith that all the wisdom man could ever gain was to be found in the classical authors, numerous manuscripts of whose works they bore home with superstitious reverence. In vain wiser men protested against the substitution of resurrected thought for original thought. In vain the Church resisted the flood of sensuousness. The day of "classical humanism" had arrived.

Its characteristics were: first, a wave of artistic productiveness with small intellectual content but much charm, most of it lacking in originality and imitative of ancient models; second, a wave of bookish erudition. What was reborn in the Renaissance was a worn-out old man of the past. In Renaissance esteem a learned person was one who knew Greek, one who had soaked himself in the classical poets, philosophers, historians, and dramatists. Insofar as he himself made

or wrote or thought anything, it must be in the manner of the worthies of long ago. The best that could be done was to dig up and if possible to imitate what had been created in olden times, times which were romantically envisioned. Medievalism began to die, replaced by the imitation of a culture even more out of date. So powerful was the classical humanist movement that it nearly monopolized thought and captured the schools and universities. It left an impress upon education which can even now be felt.

Classical humanism made the Renaissance, but it has had little to do with the making of the world of today. One can find in the twentieth century small trace of those interests which made and ruled the intellectual life of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not to speak of the eighteenth. The controlling element in the development of modern culture has been the growth of inductive science, to which both the Middle Ages and the Renaissance gave little attention.

A renewed interest in observing facts accurately and reasoning out generalizations on the basis of such observations, which is what inductive science is, began, it is true, back in the Middle Ages. It started with a realization on the part of many wise men that their thinking was defective, and it was aided by influences which entered France and Italy from Sicily and Spain, to which the Moslems had brought the respectable scientific method of the Arabs. It is interesting to speculate about what might have come

into being from a combination of such scientific induction, scholastic deduction, and highly developed religious technique. Such a union might have resulted in the most perfect thought and the most adequate education ever known. But, as we have said, classical humanism interfered. Then the Reformation split Europe, and inductive science was retired by Protestant leaders to a limbo even more Stygian than that into which the medieval world had pushed it, to reemerge only as part of an unbalanced reaction. At length science reappeared with a rush, to take the center of the intellectual stage, crowding everything else to one side and eventually producing the warped twentieth century.

The distinguishing feature of modern thought and therefore of modern education has been this rise of scientific interest and the development of scientific method, increasingly at the expense of the other experiential disciplines.

Those who would rightly estimate today's education should understand what modern science is and what it is not, as defined by scientists themselves. Essentially it consists of analytical observation of all things that can be perceived by the senses—sight, taste, touch, hearing, smell—aided by instruments designed to augment, amplify, and correct these senses; the accurate measurement of what may be so observed; the systematic arrangement of what has been discovered; the induction, by comparing observations, of hypotheses concerning them; a testing of

hypotheses by controlled experimentation. Of any observable phenomenon science asks: "What is this?" and "Whence comes it?" and "How does it behave?" With the "Why?" of anything, with its essential meaning, with more subtle matters than can be observed with the senses, science is not concerned. No reputable scientist denies this limitation. His interest *as a scientist* lies with facts and forces and with nothing else.

It was to such strictly limited science that our Western world turned at the close of the Renaissance, its appetite whetted by revolt against a mysticism which had grown precious and against the ghoulish posings of neo-classicism. "Away with all this rubbish," men said to themselves. "Give us something tangible. Let us observe what can be observed and generalize our observations. So we shall come to understand our world. So we shall come to understand ourselves. So shall we find Truth." Since the seventeenth century this search has been carried on with ever-increasing thoroughness and with an earnestness unparalleled in the ages which went before.

Science has transformed everything. Some of its many good products have been intricate machines which have made possible, for the masses, possessions and activities undreamed of before even as luxuries, curative and preventive medical and surgical devices and sanitary arrangements which have doubled the span of life for the ordinary man, means of communi-

cation which have brought all nations into neighborhood with one another, though not into peace. Not all its products have been so beneficent. Among the less desirable results of modern science have been: a decay of the common arts, a substitution of machine tending for creative handicraftsmanship, a crowding of people into cities and a depopulation of the countrysides, a decay of individuality among persons and peoples, a corruption of that democracy which began in the walled towns but can scarcely exist when political groupings become so large that acquaintance ceases.

Important as these good and bad products have been, they have been only incidental to scientific advance. More important is the vast knowledge of the cosmos, of matter-energy, which has been dug out and classified—"pure science" as distinct from "applied science." This new knowledge is wholly to the good, although some would insist that the very vastness of discovered fact has prevented an understanding by contemporary man of much of what has been discovered. Most important of all, and most unfortunate, has been the increased assumption, now held by a majority of people, including an immense number of educators, that scientific knowledge is the only knowledge that really is knowledge at all. This notion is pernicious, dangerous to mankind. One of the chief problems in education today is how to restore a realization that man is meant to be not merely a scientific methodologist and mechanical workman but a poet,

a dreamer, a mystic, an artist, and a philosopher as well. No sane person will deny, even though he remembers disquieting developments, the mighty contribution for good, not merely to human living but to human thinking, made by modern science. There are, however, a good many thinking people, including some eminent scientists, who fear that in an excessive devotion to science we are becoming as lopsided as were any of our ancestors, that our education has again become unbalanced; who feel that we are leaving dormant, undeveloped, the artistic, creative, poetic, religious faculties in our children; who believe that we are out of touch with the wide stream of human experience and in peril because of it.*

III

It is not necessary nowadays to stress the importance of cultivating scientific experience. Everyone knows that no matter how much a man discovers through his senses, aided and augmented by scientific apparatus, no matter how much he classifies what he has observed, no matter how much he uses his reason to arrive at the correlation of natural phenomena, he is in no possible danger of doing it too well. Nor is there any need to present a brief for the necessity of culti-

* "The guiding faith of philosophy is that lasting truth can be achieved only by knowing everything relatedly The truth is the whole, and every phase of life must testify, no testimony is to be given priority without careful examination, be it that of physics or of religion." Peter A. Bertocci, *College Reading and Religion*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1948.

vating powers of artistic creativeness or promoting social experience; nor too much need for the deepening of reverence for the totality of nature. What must be rediscovered is that if a human being leaves out religious experience he is also, like the Greeks, depriving himself of an access to Reality which properly is his.*

It is not by following the pathway of logical necessity that one is best led to an appreciation of religion as a factor in life and thinking and therefore of education but rather by considering the vast number of highly intelligent and useful people, both past and present, who have known Reality in terms of an ultimate Person, who have discovered by experience that the all-inclusive *It* presupposes the all-sufficient *He*, who have found that there is in the universe something which corresponds to the ability of man to arrive at personal contacts, who have, in short, fallen in love with God. Wise persons look at religion not so

* "For thousands of years religion has been a major force—often the supreme force—in the emotional life of mankind. For hundreds of years in the western world religious organizations were almost the sole source of education, in both the narrower and the broader sense. Not to recognize religion, religious organizations, and religious impulses in the life of today is to blind ourselves to some of the most significant elements in mental health for individuals and for society." W. C. Ryan, *Mental Health through Education*, Commonwealth Fund, Division of Publication, New York, 1938.

And also John S. Brubacher: "No young student is adequately introduced to contemporary American education unless he has portrayed for him the place occupied in our educational system by the religious part of our culture." *College Reading and Religion*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1948.

much as a recognized system of doctrine or discipline or ecclesiastical organization but more as this experience of falling in love with God. The wise religionist himself constantly studies and bids other men study the spiritual geniuses of the race. From them alone may be reached an understanding of the proper place of religious experience in education.

It is often difficult to get through to this heart of religion. The externals deceive us if we are not careful. Almost all the current arguments against religion in education turn out to have nothing much to do with religion. They are arguments based on observation of things accidental and incidental and external to religion. We are apt to condemn churches, which should be the embodiment of religion, with their creeds, liturgies, moral codes, while we fail to perceive the life which moves within them and makes possible and necessary such derivative things. There was a time when ecclesiastical worldliness and superficiality seemed less reprehensible than they do today, because then the churches were able to justify their existence by regulating considerable segments of secular life. Now these incidental functions have been curtailed. Art, architecture, literature, most of education and learning, the regulation of sex morals and marriage, superintendence of wills and bequests, statecraft—these are now handled extra-ecclesiastically. The Church, since it no longer looks after them, seems to many obsolescent.

What we forget is that there always has existed and

still exists, behind a not altogether lovely ecclesiastical shell, giving it a meaning, the quiet life of the long succession of the saints, the people who have been in love with God and who through that love have found peace. It is the lovers and beloved of God who have led men on—mostly unaided by churchly diplomats, often opposed by them, sometimes crucified. It is these seeking and finding souls who have revealed to us the nature of the religious experience and its importance. They bear an able and competent witness. They have been chiefly concerned, not with building anything, organizing anything, governing anything, controlling anybody's conduct against his will, but with a search of the human spirit for God.

Religion is a mystical thing. It does not consist merely or primarily in being good or in doing good to one's brothers. A religious man endeavors, as far as he can, to be good and to do good to men, but for a purpose greater than the being or doing of it. He seeks good and practices it because he finds that any other life cuts him off from a communion with Reality which, once he has found it, he will by no means forego. He does good because by doing it he finds himself freed for a companionship higher than that of any man or of all men.

When we examine the lives and writings of the saints we discover that to them religion is nothing less than a living and conscious experience of contact with a Spirit, a Meaning, who is before all things and in all things and beyond all things, who loves as

no mortal being can love; who can be loved with a degree of self-surrender such as no created being will permit us; who through that love reveals such significance, such possibilities, in the world and in oneself, as are not only past words to express but also past the power of man otherwise to discover. To be religious is to find essentially within one's universe a love past knowledge, to taste peace beyond imagination; to feel, all unafraid, the pulsing energy which eternally creates all things, including ourselves. Such is the experience of the mystics, and such is their admittedly symbolical language. They have come to know what may be apprehended only when man, after seeking to discover as much as he can by science, by creativeness, by social contacts, by a contemplation of nature, yet realizes that he must and may be nurtured by the personal touch of an eternal Compassion. Such witness cannot be ignored by anyone who is looking for an adequate education—and will not be, except from prejudice.

The place of the religionist in education today is that of the scientist in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; he vigorously protests against improper curtailment of experience. The religionist has replaced the scientist as the reminding voice from the wilderness. He cries aloud that what man most needs to cultivate is what he most neglects, that he should supplement his knowledge of facts with that knowledge of supreme Personality which gives meaning to facts and to life. The religionist is quite sure

that modern man is not in the full stream of human experience, that he needs to be reintroduced to the contemplation of God. He insists that unless modern man be so persuaded, the human race will continue to grow increasingly unbalanced.

For a long time the necessity of cooperation between the religionist and the scientist in the quest for truth and in an adequate education has not been recognized; and those who in reality have had no quarrel have become highly suspicious of one another. This suspicion has been due not so much to the scientists or to the religionists but rather to a third group of people who, with the best intention in the world, have greatly bothered everybody. One is tempted to call these troublesome persons the "literary men" and would perhaps do so except that the term ordinarily includes also those literary artists who beautifully create in verse and prose and are thereby justified. Let us call the troublemakers by a name of which they themselves are sometimes enamored—"members of the intelligentsia." The present situation of this group is not unlike what it was during the Renaissance. It is quite possible that an amicable arrangement could have then been reached by which scientific experience would have supplemented religious and artistic and social experience, had it not been for the confusion caused by the classical humanists, who were the "members of the intelligentsia" of their day. One of the best things that could happen at the present time would be for those with experience

of nature and those with experience of God to join in putting these people into their proper place.

The leading religionists at the moment do not seem to be against science and the leading scientists are not any more against religion. Indeed, scientists are often alarmingly sympathetic toward religion. Their will to assist in its reutterance is not always tempered by knowledge. They say extraordinary and sometimes ignorant things when they endeavor to make pronouncements about God and the spirit. The sermon of the average preacher when he deals with scientific matters is certainly no more inept than the lectures and articles about religion which many scientific men have lately been tempted into writing. But, while many of the utterances of leading scientists about religion are more than a little childish, from what they say it is at least certain that they are not opposed to religion. Indeed, they are vocally desirous of finding a way to supplement the knowledge which they have gained scientifically, whose intrinsic limitations no one understands better than they do.

It is this other group who sit in the seat of the scorners and disturb intellectual clarity: the bright young people of forty-five or fifty years of age, clever chaps of between the wars, defenders of what was the modern mind when they were growing up. They seem quite unaware that the world of thought has moved in the last twenty years. They control organs of expression which help mold the ideas of the ignorant; they edit subsidized journals of opinion; they con-

struct most of the smart columns and syndicated editorials in the daily press; they write a good many of our plays and movies; most of all they are to be found in large numbers in those sequestered brotherhoods, the literary faculties of our undergraduate colleges.

Their stock in trade consists for the most part of the following things: (1) an openmouthed admiration for science, all the greater because they have rarely submitted themselves to the humbling discipline of scientific technique; (2) a vast contempt for the religions of the past, which they have rarely taken the trouble to examine; (3) an insistence upon a supposed analogy between the universe and an evolving organism, an analogy which fails to take into consideration lately discovered physicochemical phenomena that make organic evolution seem only an incidental feature of the cosmic scheme; (4) a strange joy in maintaining that man is but a beast, combined with a delicate pacifism which, be it admirable or not, at least is inconsistent with beastliness—a sort of desire to be Nietzsche and John Dewey at the same time; and (5) a willingness to reverse the old prescription and say instead of, "You shall know the Truth, and the Truth will make you free," rather, "By mere freedom from standards and restraints you shall arrive at the Truth." Amid such strange ideas as these they live and move and have their being.

The world as a whole, particularly the world of thought, is moving away from these eager persons, but they still continue to muddy the waters of thought

and of education. They seem to think that a man of affairs is a hopeless Philistine, a Babbitt; and they appeal from him and his world to Russia and the Russians, ignorant that Russia and the Russians promptly consign such freethinking gentlemen as themselves to slave camps or firing squad. They become more and more ethereal, more and more precious, more and more irritable. For a long time they have denounced religion in the name of science, and they often attack science in the name of art.

The best thing to do with them educationally is to ignore them. If the physical scientists, the religionists, the naturalists, the artists, and the students of human contacts could unite to bestow upon them the privilege of talking exclusively to one another and could turn jointly to the reconsideration of what constitutes true education, to the restoration of sound thinking based upon adequate experience, there would be less confusion of mind in educational circles and more of that mutually helpful cooperation which properly exists between those who, by various methods and by complementary avenues, are seeking the one Truth. It is unfortunately true that most educators do not sufficiently ignore literary dabblers but are, rather, unduly impressed by them. This may be because a great many educators are unskilled in the experimental disciplines, because they themselves too often are creatures of a superficial educational regimen. They need not be so permanently, and indeed they are beginning to recover, beginning to ac-

quire respect for *all* the disciplines. Still, for the most part they have a long way yet to go.

Boys and girls have a right to be trained in how to be reverent contemplators of nature, scientists, creative artists, lovers of mankind, lovers of God. Will the education of tomorrow hold the fivefold experiential bases of knowledge in adjusted balance? Only if general popular interest demands that this be done, and there would seem to be no immediate likelihood of that. Meanwhile, in the case of those children whom the enlightened few may nurture, a balanced growth may be encouraged.

8. A Child's Religion

IF ONE would know what religious education is, one must first understand what religion is. Religion down the centuries has consisted of attempts by human beings to get in touch with a totality of things which eludes them unless they assume that the universe is the creation and self-expression of a Supernatural Being who can love and be loved. Man has recognized, first without much thought and later after a great deal of thought, that what is back of everything and beneath everything must be at least as great as himself, must, that is to say, be at least personal. He is unlimited, but He is unlimited *personality*. He may be more than personal. About that we can know nothing, because anything more than personal is beyond man's power of conception. For the savage and the educated man alike, religion has always been the attempt by those on earth to come into contact with Reality in terms of a person, the ultimate Person.*

* There are, to be sure, religions without gods, but they are undeveloped religions. No major or mature religion is included among them. Those interested in a brief résumé of how religions develop from a sense of *manu* through fetishism and animism into theism are referred to my book, *A Man Can Live*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1947, the chapter entitled "What Is God Like?"

Religion is the adoration which one gives to this ultimate Person. It is the search with what is in man for what is in God. In this search are involved theologies, ecclesiologies, hagiologies, politics, liturgies, moralities; but the essence of the thing is interpersonal communion between the worshipers and the God. This comradeship with God is of a sort which may be found to a limited degree in human friendships, human loves. The contact of person with person is recognized as real and valuable even though it cannot be explained. In the history of the human race the experience of God has been to human beings important, satisfying, illuminating, and maturing; only an exceedingly doctrinaire materialist would think of denying its validity and its necessity for normal people.

Dr. Whitehead, in his Lowell lectures for 1926,* pointed out that all religions develop in four stages. These stages are ritual; story or myth; faith or belief; rationalization or interpretation. They do not succeed one another in any chronological order; rather they amplify one another. If we give them the symbols *R*, *S*, *F*, and *I*, the development of any religion in the world's history will be found to follow this formula: $R = RS = RSF = RSFI$. The fully matured religions, the ones that have mattered most to mankind, are those which have reached the fourth stage: such religions as Mahayana Buddhism, Juda-

* Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.

ism, Christianity. Mohammedanism never quite got to the fourth stage. Greek religion never got much beyond the second.

Religions start with rituals, things done in the beginning not so much because they mean anything as because they excite emotions which are deemed good for the group and satisfying to individuals. After ritual goes on for a long while, people begin to explain it, give to it a story. They say, "We do this because once upon a time this took place." Sometimes, as in the case of Christianity, the story is not fanciful but factual, and frequently old rituals are explained by a new story. In Judaism, for example, the central story of the greatest holy day of the year is that of God's deliverance of Israel, under Moses, from oppression by the Egyptian Pharaohs, symbolic of Jehovah's ability to deliver his people from all suffering and death. The ritual to which this story is attached, that of the Passover, is far older than Moses; its probable origin lies in a ceremonial attempt, later outgrown, to appease the Deity by sacrifice of one's first-born son. The older ritual has been taken over and religiously reexplained in terms of what may in fact be the central historic experience of the Israelites, what certainly is their central tradition as a people. To take another example, the celebration of the Mass by Catholic Christians involves ritualistic acts as old as humanity, all brought together and given meaning in terms of the sacrificial life and death of Jesus Christ.

The third stage in the development of religion is a realization by the worshipers, as they go through the ritual in terms of the story or myth, of immediate contacts between themselves and Reality. From this is born faith, a personal intrustment which, as St. Paul wrote, is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." When such experiences of faith are generalized into a form of words we have an article of belief, a dogma, a creed. Dogma is a synthesis of personal experimentations. As St. Vincent of Lerins said, the only human test for the utter truth of any dogma would be that it should have been found true everywhere, always, by all.

For clearness, because the point is exceedingly important in education, let it be repeated that religions never begin with intellectual systems, with balanced philosophies. That is where the process *ends*. They begin with ritual, progress from that to stories, go on from stories to acts of personal faith, and so to dogmas. Finally men interpret the dogmas and correlate them with their rational digests of other sorts of experience. Only then do we have a truly adult religion.

The point of stating all this, which students of the history of religions know well enough but of which the general public seems largely unaware, is to draw attention to the fact that nine-tenths at least of contemporary efforts toward religious education ignore the fundamental religious process. What is true of the growth of a group religion is also true of

the development of an individual's religion, of a growing child's religion. The process cannot safely be ignored or reversed, and nobody ought to feel that there is any necessity for doing so. Yet people do try to reverse it. They attempt to argue little children into religious concepts or to teach them dogmas which they are not old enough to understand; and, most of all, they ignore the fact that ritual, as religion grows, is not something which is supplanted or sloughed off and replaced by belief and at length by rationalization but rather something which takes on ever deeper meaning with the thought devoted to it.

These mistakes are more characteristic of Protestantism than of Catholicism, of Liberal Judaism than of Orthodox Judaism. Protestantism and Liberal Judaism seem at the present time to be losing religious appeal, as distinct from sociable appeal, not so much because their theology is bad as because their pedagogy is atrocious. They assume that religion is a thing primarily of the intellect, of the reason. Religion is that only to an adult person, and not even to him, as a rule, unless he has gone through the previous stages. Even Catholicism of late years, especially in America, seems to be losing its grip on sound educational psychology. Instead of Catholicism's copying the bad teaching methods of Protestantism, it would be better advised to stick to its ancient methods, and it would be well for Protestants to learn anew this simple lesson—that a child of any age

must learn to love God and continue to adore God if he is eventually to understand God.

Until very lately the race has known well enough that the first religious thing you teach a child is ritualistic and symbolic action. You may know what the ritual means, but it is not at all necessary for the child to know. At least in the beginning it is impossible for him to understand it. We are so accustomed to using the ritualistic method for child training in other fields than religion that there would seem small reason for fighting shy of it in this field.

A child is taught, for instance, in a decent home, that a door closed upon a private apartment must not be opened without permission. It is not necessary for him to understand the principle of privacy; he simply must not open the door. This is a ritualistic taboo, quite as truly as the one which prohibits the child from making noises in church. We teach little boys to take off their hats when they meet women. They do not understand that these skirted persons are entitled to respect because of actual or potential motherhood. It is not necessary for them to understand it. The only thing required is that they take off the hats. This is as truly a piece of ritual as sinking to one's knees when one says one's prayers or bowing before the symbol of crucified God, as truly a piece of ritual as the symbolic acts performed in the family of a Jewish child at the Feast of the Passover. When a woman enters a room, in a household of de-

cent politeness, little boys are taught to rise. They do not know the philosophy of the thing. It is ritual pure and simple, like the custom of bowing low when the sacring bell rings in the Mass. The child does not comprehend the doctrine of the Real Presence, but he does come to recognize the reality of relationship between himself and God because he has bowed low and keeps on bowing low. Automatically he learns the custom of recognition.

That ritual is the first step in religion for a normal child is true no matter what the religion may be. Even Comte, perhaps the most anti-Christian social philosopher of the nineteenth century, realized the validity of ritual for educational purposes; he devised a whole system of feasts and fasts and customs whereby Positivism might be soundly inculcated. One reason why Positivism has never amounted to anything much is that his followers accepted the philosophy but forgot the ritual. A little child learns almost everything through doing, through expression. Even those of us who are mature learn new things best that way. More people always have been and still are converted to religion by the beauty, dignity, and mystery of devotional approach than by all the argument in the world.

The child will not, however, remain interested in ritual or find it satisfactory for very long unless it is given in his mind a dramatic connotation. There must come an explanation, but it must be concrete

rather than abstract. Abstractions are too difficult for little folks and for most big folks. All the religions which have mattered in the world have recognized this. The meaning of their rituals has necessarily been expressed in stories. Some of these have been purely imaginative; some, like most of the classical myths, have been based upon historical facts highly idealized; some have been literally true. Christianity was most effectively promoted in the beginning and is best promoted now not by teaching philosophy but by reciting stories: the story of Bethlehem, of God who became a baby; the stories of Christ's life, which reveal God as the compassionate friend of man; the story of the Cross, of rejection and pain transfigured from disaster into creative power; the story of the Resurrection, the eternal paradox of man who, though he dies, yet may so have lived that he does not perish. Wherever Christianity has remained vital and compelling these stories have not been divorced from the ritual, nor have they taken the place of the ritual. They explain the ritual, most of which is far older than the stories. Baptism is understood in terms of Bethlehem, Holy Communion is made an extension of Calvary, and so on. In Protestant Christianity, where Baptism is a thing only occasionally seen and where children are excluded from attendance at the Liturgy, the same opportunities are not open as in the more ancient forms of Christianity. Even in historic Protestantism, however, the stories have been tied up with bits of ritual: the solemn reading of the Bible

by the father of the household, family prayers, hymn singing.

As soon as a child is old enough to enjoy stories at all—and that comes very early indeed—he should be taught those of his religion; but it is unlikely that he will perceive the importance of the stories unless the telling of them is accompanied by the ritual acts which make up the common devotional practice of his coreligionists.

Even stories and ritual together will not produce a religious boy or girl unless sooner or later there is added some immediate contact with Reality, unless the child comes to feel a sense of personal oneness with That Which Is. Only when this happens does the child's conscious and personal religious life have its beginning. Only then can he understand what is meant by the creedal statements or the ritual acts of his faith.

Between the ages of ten and fifteen the child is apt to have, thanks to the starting of adolescence, a quickened power of apprehending Deity just as he has a quickened power of apprehending other people. If he has been brought up on ritual, the ritual ceases to be formal and becomes vital in the light of these new experiences; the stories, which heretofore have been merely interesting and beautiful, become illuminating. The dogmas of his faith are no longer merely words to be recited parrotlike but symbols of a vision which his fathers have seen and which he himself has begun to glimpse.

With most people religious development never gets past this stage. The final step, rationalization—the working out of a synthesis between religious experience and other experience—is beyond the power of most men, even of many who have brilliant gifts. Still, every man feels *something* of a desire to intellectualize his religion. Opportunity must be afforded for the fullest examination that the growing individual is willing and able to make. Questions must be permitted, encouraged. At least attempts at answers must be provided. There must be no intellectual coercion. All pertinent information has to be faced.

In an attempt to make all this concrete and practical, it may be said that those who wish to train children religiously should begin by careful participation with them in religious ritual. This should go on from babyhood until they are at least fifteen. Boys and girls should regularly attend worship, regularly perform the accustomed obeisances, regularly say the prayers, regularly keep the fasts and feasts of that faith to which the family gives its allegiance. It does not much matter, at least until the child is ten years old, if the performance is automatic. In addition to this, from the time when the child is three or four until he is fifteen or so, he should be taught the story content of his faith—not for the sake of the stories but to give reason for the devotional acts into which he has been initiated. During adolescence, or before, he should be encouraged in such mystical experiments as he wishes to make, even though they seem extrava-

gant to older people. His gropings should be treated with the utmost respect, even though to adult eyes they look ludicrous. This is the time also to teach him the fundamental dogmas of his faith, not as magical formulas but as indications that what he is struggling toward other men have struggled toward and to some extent found. Finally, when he begins to ask questions about his religion, he should be given all the information possible concerning it (and also concerning the religions of other people) and encouraged to think out its relationships with the rest of knowledge and the rest of life. This complex of ritual and story and belief and rationalization is long and involved but it is the only method of teaching religion that ever, as far as we have record in the history of mankind, has been effective.

II

It has been noted in a previous chapter that the secularized school system of America, at least until an aroused citizenry demands it, will not and indeed cannot educate religiously. If this is so, then parents of public-school children who desire to initiate their children into that one of the race's basic types of revealing experience which, more than any other, develops the sort of maturity our age dangerously lacks must prepare to do the religious teaching themselves. At least for the immediately foreseeable future, the religious education of the vast majority of American boys and girls must be handled at home or not at all

It is undeniable that the young men and women now coming of age in America are for the most part not religious, realize next to no obligation to love and serve God. They are not opposed to religion; they simply do not know enough about religion to have discovered that it has relevancy to life, that it throws light on the meaning of things, that it involves anything much that is of importance to individuals or nations. Anyone who has known our young people in the armed forces, anyone who looks at them in colleges and universities or in social life, sees this only too well. Among Americans under thirty to be religious is definitely to be odd, eccentric, out of line. So general is irreligion among our young people that when one of them does get really interested in religion he is apt to feel what T. S. Eliot has aptly called "an odd and rather exhilarating feeling of isolation." * All this may seem less true of Catholics than of Protestants or Jews, but it is worth noting that many candid Catholics, clerical and lay, admit more than a little distress at absence from Mass and disinterest in the spiritual life on the part of younger people. That the statement is, on the whole, justified, no observer of the American scene will disallow, except perhaps some of those professionally engaged in the advertisement of ecclesiastical enterprises.

This is a matter of concern to serious-minded ob-

* From "Thoughts after Lambeth" in *Selected Essays 1917-1932*, p. 315, Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., New York, 1932.

servers of the social scene generally, and especially to a good many parents now in middle years who realize that somehow they have failed to impart to their older children adequate religious motivations and sanctions and who wish they knew how to do a better job with those still young enough to be plastic. It is also a matter of concern to a growing minority of young men and women now in their twenties who, far from being proud of their irreligion, realize that because of it they are unanchored to anything sure and reliable, are unable to arrive at strength or to retain serenity sufficient for life in a chaotic world. Most of all it disturbs that group who, themselves lately become fathers and mothers, would like to give their babies what they themselves have too little gained: some simple and firm hold on a Reality deeper than the flux of that which comes and goes.

There are a great many parents, by no means all of them adherents of organized religion, who realize that how to know God has a place, and that no mean place, in a sound education. They perceive easily enough that if human life is to become significant or safe, children as they grow up must somehow learn to dig beneath the superficialities of sensation. They are well aware that a way of living based on nothing more substantial than self-expression and a desire to get on in the world does not lead to poise, sanity, tolerance, inner peace, courage. They understand that, if conduct is not based on search for an Absolute of some kind and on service of that Absolute, morality

becomes first a matter of fluid expediency and then a blind obedience to the merely strong. They have no wish for their boys and girls to grow up slaves of a magical superstition, but equally they do not want them to be shuttlecocks blown from vanity to vanity and so at last, in sheer weariness, into the harbor of a sinister dictatorship which they have neither the wit to understand nor the competence to resist.

It is certain that growth in spiritual competence cannot be left to the children themselves. Happily one meets less than one used to the superficial liberal who does not wish to influence his children in favor of any religious discipline so that, when these children grow up, they may choose their own religion, or none, as they may prefer. Such an attitude is proper only toward things unessential, casual, of the surface; and most thinking people know that, whatever else may or may not be true of religion, at least it does go to the depths of life and that in consequence religious nurture must begin under guidance in babyhood and develop under guidance until adult years. It is not enough to do what a puzzled savant in Boston did a generation ago: namely, read Bible stories to his children before the fire on Sunday evenings in the twilight and let the whole thing go at that. He frequently whetted the spiritual appetite of his little audience, but they went to bed hungry.

Nor will it do—and thinking parents are aware of it—to be content to send the children to some neighboring catechism or Sunday school for, with brilliant

but rare exceptions, such well-meant schools are unbelievably bungling and inept; and anyhow, what can be done even by the best of them in an hour or two a week? The secular schools, as has been said, help very little, sometimes definitely hinder. The public ones apparently hold that any searching examination of the meaning of life, of death, of God, is irrelevant. The private schools, with rare exceptions, equally ignore religion. Even those among them which call themselves "church schools" seem chiefly concerned to turn out a product conditioned to a conventional and essentially secularistic way of life, which has long been respectable but may conceivably no longer be useful or possible, and shy away from any approach to Reality that transcends social patterns. They are usually content to regard religion as a subject to be studied rather than as an experience which can illuminate all knowing and which may, as likely as not, turn the world upside down. The father set on giving a full nurture to his children is driven more and more to the realization that what is to be done for the welfare of their souls must be done chiefly at home, by himself and his wife.*

To say that parents must be responsible for reli-

* "What is needed is that the parent shall himself offer in his own life as sound and creative a pattern of intellectual integrity and of religious faith as possible; that he shall see to it that the riches of the religious heritage in our culture are opened to the child; and that friendly intellectual exploration and interchange of viewpoints shall introduce the growing mind in a stimulating way to the problem of discovering what for him will prove the truth " Hornell and Hart, *Personality and the Family*, D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1941.

gious education is nothing new. Every observer of Judaism, for example, soon becomes aware that the cult, the code, the creed of that persistent faith centers about family ceremonial and family ways of behaving. Make the Jewish home impossible, and you soon see the decay of Hebrew religion. The Jew has always thought of the race-church as a collection of covenanted households, each of them a religious unit. Temple worship, synagogue worship is no substitute for domestic piety; the collective devotions are those of the heads of families, who meet together on the basis of what each household believes and practices of the ancient ways. From the earliest days of Israel the duty of imparting to each oncoming generation the religious wisdom of the past has been given not to the state, not to the church, not to the school, not to priest or prophet or rabbi, but to the parents. It has been so in Christianity, too, which grew out of Judaism and is, in its own estimation at least, a perfected and universalized Judaism. In the "days of faith" Christian fathers and mothers were the teachers, aided by priests and other professional instructors; it was not the latter who were assisted by the former. When church and home forget their true relationship, at that instant Christianity ceases to manifest vitality and begins to degenerate into a less and less significant convention.

The centralization of religious culture in the family is a matter not only of history but of necessity. For what is a religion? It is not a set of facts or a system

of philosophy or a code of ethical precepts or a set of ritual conventions. It may and usually does involve all of these; but in itself it is no one of them, nor all of them put together. A religion is an attitude and a way of life based upon the recognition that behind and beneath and beyond what the senses perceive there is God, whose nature and significance must be discovered or revealed; upon the realization that everything which is, including human beings, is the creature of an infinite Being who has called all into existence and sustains all for some purpose hidden within Himself. This Being, the religionist is sure, is to be regarded with awe—a Being so wonderful as only to be apprehensible, never comprehended; a Being who must be obeyed for fear of ultimate disaster or who, if not obeyed, is to be approached with contrition and a plea to be forgiven; a Being who, notwithstanding His majesty, may yet be trusted and loved; a Being in whose hands one may place oneself and, not because one deserves it but in response to faith alone, find refuge from the inevitable tragedy inherent in circumstance.

Religion, in short, is the art of living day by day with God. Such an art is to be acquired here a little and there a little. No smallest concern of life's routine but has its relationship to Him whom one comes to believe in and to live by. Training in religion cannot be reduced to the saying by a child of a hackneyed prayer or two before he goes to bed; nor is it something to be postponed until he can be sent, perhaps

irregularly, to priest or minister or rabbi or until, at ten or twelve or so, he is crammed, poor dear, with a mass of undigested propositions and stimulated to aspire to pseudoecstasies at confirmation or first communion or some such ceremony. Religion is not something to be studied an hour or two a week, either, like nineteenth-century poetry or Roman history. It is a way of life with God. Where but in a normal home can such an art be adequately learned? *

Even though a parent may admit that all this is true, he may still feel incompetent religiously to look after his boys and girls. He may realize that he is grossly ignorant of many aspects of religious belief and practice and so be fearful of the questions the children are sure to ask him, and ought to ask him, as they keep getting older. He is entirely right in assuming the magnitude, the multiplicity, of what a religious mentor ought to know. What is involved in worship alone is a considerable subject for study. But this is not all. The parental guide needs somehow to see to it that the children remain constantly aware of

* It is true that some of the most religious men and women of today have come from irreligious homes, but at what cost of struggle toward God and His peace, of inner stress unnecessary if they had been brought up by parents who knew their business, of fundamental alienation between themselves and those parents. It is also true that many a child brought up religiously turns out to be what seems an irreligious adult, but the irreligion in these cases is apt to be more apparent than real. A godly orientation, though it may be forgotten consciously, often remains subconsciously effective and in time of stress comes to the surface of the mind. Many a convert of mature years only rediscovers what has never been forgotten: a religion imparted to him in its essence when he was very small indeed.

what religion is, that they do not forget that its simple purpose is to bring together in mutual love human beings and God, God who is the beginning and the end, God with whom is purpose. No one can explain to them the full scope of religion; but more and more they need to be helped to perceive its basic character. Only thus can they be saved from regarding it as a series of ritual performances or creedal statements without pertinency to life or, even more inadequately, as "morality tinged with emotion." If the parent is to teach religion, first he must understand it himself.

There is need that religion be taught in such a way that the children perceive the relationship between creed and conduct. Neither the Jewish nor the Christian morality is a natural morality; both recognize supernatural demands and rest on supermundane sanctions. If children are not helped to understand this they soon regard as absurd the ways of living which their faith prescribes. If there is no God, to take obvious examples, free love is entirely defensible, and politics based on force is inevitable. Our secularized world denies more and more the validity of a moral code based on anything but expediency. Children soon discover that this is true. They must be assisted to see that their religious parents also know it but are sure that the secularized world is mistaken and, because of its error, self-destructive. Unless parents are willing themselves and can impart to their young people a willingness, to defy the *mores*,

they need not expect that their boys and girls will very long make a serious attempt to live according to the ethical teachings of religion.

The usual parent stands paralyzed when he contemplates the many phases of religious knowledge which, as he well knows, he must somehow impart to his offspring: the art of worship; a technique of individual piety; that moral challenge of religious belief which hits home to the very foundations of modern living, personal and social; an understanding of the great souls whose lives with and for God have timeless significance and beauty. These aspects of religion cannot be taught seriatim; they form an interwoven pattern. No wonder he trembles a bit in anticipation.

But there is no need for him to feel utterly discouraged and, because there is much to be taught, teach nothing at all. He may begin with what is most readily within his competence: the decent conduct of family devotions and a regular and humble attendance with his children at the ancient ceremonies. The rest will follow more naturally and easily than might be supposed. Almost every pastor will welcome requests for assistance and advice. A church's Sunday or weekday classes can sometimes be used to supplement the home instruction, though the parent should take care, so various are the merits of these schools, not to send a child to one of them until he has first visited it in action and seen with his own eyes what goes on. And, as in every kind of education, once a

right start is made a good many problems are solved *ambulando*, problems which seemed in advance impossible to handle. The parent finds that he himself must learn and can learn and does learn as the growing children challenge him.

9. Religion

And Higher Education

Not long ago, while I was lecturing in Megalopolis, I received a summons to help in what was called "Religious Emphasis Week" at the neighboring University of Suburbia.* This great factory of learning, which not only comprises a college of somewhat diluted and confused liberal arts and some graduate and professional schools but further boasts of a business school that turns out every year hundreds of superclerks and experts in the tricks of salesmanship; the factorylike buildings of whose new engineering college cover acres of what was once pleasant campus lawn; whose thousands of young women students are justly famed for fresh young charm; whose football team is applauded from one end of the country to another; which, in short, is noted for almost everything that America expects from an institution of higher learning—the University of Suburbia was about to spend a few days in consideration of the Deity. I was pleased to hear it. What was the program, and where did I fit in?

* This is a real university, not a creature of my imagination. It seems unnecessary to give its right name, since in its attitude to religion it is no better and no worse than a hundred others.

It seemed that the "week" was to be four days long. On the opening night a Protestant minister, a Jewish rabbi, and a Roman Catholic priest were to speak at a "monster mass meeting" and tell wherein their faiths agreed with one another (but, curiously enough, not wherein they differed). On the following days there were to be three "great discussion sections," in which the undergraduates were to advise one another on how to apply religion to the solution of all sorts of problems: racial problems, international problems, sexual and marital problems, economic and industrial problems; and those who cared to do so were to consider "how to bring religion into harmony with science." On the last night there was to be a pageant of religion, put on with the aid of the Department of Speech, to make plain by drama and the dance the glory of God and the pertinency of faith.

The young man who approached me was the official mobilizer, the "coordinator of denominational religious activities" on the Suburbia campus. He showed no indication of having studied theology, and he had no academic distinction of any sort, but everyone said he was a wonder at getting things going and keeping them moving. I was unable to discover precisely what the things were that he was supposed to set in motion or where it was that they were supposed to move to. I asked this high-powered gentleman if the students who would attend all this knew anything about religion—its techniques, its doctrines, its history, its philosophy. He replied that he supposed they

knew as much as anybody needed to know about such matters. Did I not realize that in this modern day it is applied religion that youth is interested in, not the theoretical or dogmatic or ritualistic phases of the subject? The "program of activities"—it was his favorite phrase—had been devised by the Christian Association; it was a good program; they knew what they were about. Would I kindly write up a boost of myself to go along with a picture? Was I willing to address a faculty luncheon toward the close of the week, to "mobilize the staff into an enthusiastic backing up of God"?

"What do you want me to say to them?" I inquired.

The promoter beamed. "Anything, whatever you wish to say."

"Anything at all?"

"Anything at all." He said he would do all in his power to get the faculty out in large numbers to hear my pep talk for the Almighty.

The week turned out to be about what any thoughtful person would have expected. There were posters on every bulletin board. There were advertisements and inspired editorials in the student daily rag. Every device for publicity that the Christian Association, aided by whatever the university's Department of Public Relations could think up, was used; it must be confessed that some of them were ingenious.

The opening "mass meeting" had, in consequence, about three hundred and fifty persons present—out of a staff of more than five hundred, plus over six

thousand resident students. To this meager throng, scattered sparsely in a large auditorium, the Protestant minister gave what was evidently an old sermon out of the barrel, on "Love"; the Roman Catholic priest, embarrassed by instruction to be "not dogmatic nor sectarian nor too high-brow," endorsed brotherhood and tolerance; the rabbi warned that the Jews were unjustly persecuted and that the Christians had better lay off it. The audience then dispersed, with an air of having done its embarrassing duty, and the janitor turned out the lights.

The discussion sections, led by local ministers, each had a couple of hundred present the first day, half of that the next day, a handful the third day. At every fraternity and sorority house, each night after dinner, a visiting minister or a representative of some denomination sat around and smoked and was polite and helped such of the brothers or sisters as had no dates that evening to pool their ignorance and prejudices in what is generally called a "bull session." The final pageant got a fair-sized crowd. It was pretty and sentimental; the exact meaning of it no one seemed able to figure out. This ended the student part of Religious Emphasis Week in the University of Suburbia.

"Are you satisfied?" I asked the hard-hitting coordinator.

"Well," he admitted, "the crowd did not turn out. I guess maybe it's this postwar uncertainty that's the trouble. But anyway, this university has recognized

God, and that matters a lot. Now for the faculty luncheon. That's where you shine."

"Will there be anyone there, do you suppose?" I inquired.

"We have sent a post card to every man and every woman on the staff. You'll see."

I did. There were seventy who sat down to the meal. Fourteen were local ministers and religious workers, not university people at all. Nine were nonteaching employees: stenographers, bookkeepers, clerks. Of the forty-seven faculty members present (out of a total of over five hundred) eighteen were instructors. That left twenty-nine of professorial rank. Only one was the head of a department. The president, who had told me a few days before how glad he was that his university was "showing in this week its true interest in religion," sent word at the last moment that he had to be present at a finance committee meeting in the city and could he please be excused.

Well, there was nothing to lose by frankness; I might as well open up boldly. There were not many present, but word would get around the campus, never fear. And so, after the usual polite palaver and a professional joke or two, I began in earnest. The following is the substance of what I had to say.

The American university, I began, of which Suburbia is not untypical, does not in reality care a button about religion.* It regards religion not as an experi-

* There are those who think that this is not true, such observers as Merimon Cuninggim (*The College Seeks Religion*, Yale University Press,

mental technique which, along with science and the arts, helps man to understand the universe sufficiently so that he can live in it without being reduced to boredom or despair. It looks on religion as one of the minor amusements, like china painting or playing the flute, pleasant for those who enjoy that sort of thing but not an intellectual or a practical necessity.* In consequence, it is willing to relegate consideration of religion to a minor, decreasing, hardly more than microscopic place in the curriculum; to make it an elective study for a few specialists to pursue, useful chiefly in the preparation of young men who wish to

New Haven, 1947) and Clarence P. Shedd of Yale (various articles and books) and Edward W. Blakeman (*The Administration of Religion in Universities and Colleges*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1942). For instance, Dr. Cuninggim writes: "The secularization of higher education seems to have reached its peak around the time of the First World War, since then the colleges have recaptured much of their lost concern for the religious development of their students and have increasingly assumed responsibility for such nurture." It is hard to see that the evidence offered justifies such encouraging opinions. Unless a college takes religion as seriously as it does the fine arts, not to speak of science, it can hardly be said with justice to have assumed responsibility for the religious development of its constituency. Where are such colleges to be found today in America? And are there more of them now than there were twenty-five years ago?

* Not all of them are as frank and honest about it as is the United States Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. In its catalogue for 1947 the sole mention of religion is under "The Amenities" (page 25). The first amenity listed is dancing, regularly scheduled. The second amenity, the only other one which appears, is religion. Incidentally, this Academy offers no study of philosophy in general or morals in particular, although its graduates are eventually to be uniformed officers of the United States engaged in the defense of our country and in the presentation, supposedly, of the American point of view to their enlisted men and to the world at large.

become clergymen; and to provide by way of religious nurture for the general mass of university people such ridiculous nonsense as the Religious Emphasis Week now ending, a performance which could not be regarded as other than an insult to religion—one might hope an ignorant and unintentional insult, but still an insult.

This indifference is due, I went on to say, not so much to the American university's forgetfulness of God as to its debased conception of man. Its tacit assumption is that man, obviously one of the animals, is only an animal, and that his happiness, significance, greatness are to be achieved by providing him with the increasing satisfaction of his animal appetites, the appetites for food and shelter and rest and play and sex. Education, so it thinks, is the helping of boys and girls and men and women to satisfy these essential hungers without indigestion.

What the university of today tends to forget is that man has other hungers which the lower animals do not possess and that, if he is not taught how to satisfy those hungers too, he remains individually distraught, socially dangerous, and disruptive, no matter how well he has learned to sate and does sate his lesser appetites. The true business of a university is to see to it that men and women learn to give primary consideration to how to feed the extra-animal hungers.

These *human* hungers are three: the hunger for meaning, the hunger for love, the hunger for creative craftsmanship. By feeding these hungers—or trying

his best to do so—man can arrive at life of a sort that makes sense in spite of the frustration which ends every human career, in spite of death which comes surely, swiftly.

The hunger for meaning. Every man asks “Why?” constantly, wonders not only about the whyness of his world but also about the whyness of himself. Man as a scientist dwells on the level of fact. Man as a philosopher passes to the level of significance.

Because philosophy cries aloud the primacy of “Why?” over “What?” philosophy matters less and less in academic halls, in university activities and budgets, in the minds of presidents and deans and policy committees and boards of trustees. They are wise in their generation. One can easily get money nowadays for engineering training, for applied science generally, for courses in manufacturing and buying and selling; it is not too hard to get money for such teaching as will deposit a thin veneer of alleged culture on the surface of essentially animalistic young ladies and young gentlemen; but it is harder than pulling teeth to arouse interest in philosophy, to get endowment or even current support for the teaching of it. For the study of the “Why?” of things, moreover, student customers are few and fees meager, while for the study of facts and techniques there is a ready and abundant market. One cannot blame the administrators of education too readily for their lack of concern about the meaning of the universe or the meaning of man. But one does have a right and a duty to object

to their advancing little more than man's physical prosperity while still claiming that they are truly concerned with liberal learning, with the education of free men, with the maturing of man as man. In the name of the searching and questioning spirits of the ages, in the name of all truth seekers past, present, and yet to be born, one ought to object to the using of such rubbish as Religious Emphasis Week to cover up malpractice.

The hunger for love, that sort of love in the name of which men have dreamed great dreams, written poems, done heroic deeds, found consuming joy; love which is far beyond mere glandular stimulation; love which is the greater the more one has within oneself to give. By virtue of it the strong pours himself out for the weak; the wise for the foolish; the good for the wicked. If deprived of the opportunity to develop and exercise such love, man crawls through life with hidden shame, making excuses to himself, rationalizing his failure.

Does the modern university seriously try to impart to its students or, for that matter, to its cooperating scholars a sense of the driving power of the hunger to love? To do its job in this essential respect might bring down on administrative heads the wrath of those who control contemporary society and who would have all men live in terms of gain or power or applause. No one has a right to object to a university, if it so desires, conforming to a state of things in which nearly everyone is out to grab all that he can in return for the

least investment. But one has a right to be indignant when a university which encourages its students to sell their potentialities in sacrificial loving for a mess of pottage has the effrontery to bid them remember briefly, four days a year, the primacy of God who is the Selfless Lover. There are limits to a properly tolerated indecency.

The hunger for creative craftsmanship. Unless man is prevented and thwarted he is always an artist. He is not satisfied inside himself unless he tries to do what is at hand and to do it as well as he can, whether it be hewing himself a club or conducting a laboratory experiment or building a cathedral or digging a ditch or washing a baby or writing a poem or rigging up a hat. Man has creative hunger. The university almost completely ignores the importance of this hunger. It provides its students with some opportunity to master other men's experiments but with little opportunity to create. They make nothing much, not even their own fires. Their very amusements are purchased ready-made. Because few of them gain facility in craftsmanship most of them have no great appreciation of its importance.

This would be just as well, perhaps, if the true purpose of education were to condition human beings to a world of mass production, mass distribution, mass consumption and, inevitably, mass-mindedness. If, on the other hand, the purpose of education is to help men and women arrive at a joyful life, then a university should be expected to develop, in every

human being it can touch, the will and power to do his or her own creating and to do it as beautifully as possible.

Despite a lip service to the importance of creative thinking and moral discrimination and to the necessity of a critical estimate of current patterns of behavior, those who direct the universities care for none of these things. Their chief aim is to turn out graduates who can fit comfortably, if possible eruditely, into the current pattern of living, ask no basic questions, experience no heartbreak—machine tenders, thing makers, thing users, trainers of more machine tenders, thing makers, thing users. Otherwise a university might become a breeding place of rebels, a sender forth of graduates who, unadjusted and unadjustable, would try to turn the world upside down. How tragic if young men and women should be compelled to make choice between honor and comfort! How much easier, how much more kind, how much wiser for everybody if the universities stick to their undeniably useful knitting! Great is Diana of the Ephesians!

Now religion, which is what we are talking about (I said) has emphatically to do with the good life. Its concern is that men and women should behave at any cost according to God's desire, behave, in other words, as human beings; that they not only have meaning but seek to know that meaning; that they be not only creatures but creators, not only beloved but lovers, not only children of earth but aspirants to comradeship.

ship with the seers and the saints. There never has been a religion that matters—nor can there be—which is not based on man's struggle to become truly man.

The primary measure of a university's irreligion is the extent to which it permits scholars and learners to ignore the study of how man is meant by God (or by Things As They Cosmically Are, if one is afraid to use the simpler word) to behave himself. In the University of Suburbia, for example, out of over six thousand students only forty-two were that year giving any time at all to ethical study. It makes an honest man righteously angry to see a university which is indifferent to ethics, a university which has abandoned its proper job and become scarcely more than a training school for plumbers of all sorts and a place for the delicate pursuit of unrelated pedantries—to see such a university for a few days indulge in "emphasizing God." If I were a member of the faculty, I should think it necessary to raise merry hell about it.

But religion is not merely moral science. Religion has to do not only with knowing what the good life is but with living it when one discovers what it is. Man soon comes to realize, if he sees and hears and thinks, that without help from whatever is greater than man (and certainly greater than man's environment) he is not likely to dare greatly enough to become and remain a seeker for meaning, a lover, a creator. Even learned scholars know that, if left unaided, courage fails as they contemplate the vastness

of truth and the difficulty of learning and of living, and their mortality. They know that it is because of weakness of will that they make the compromises which they rightly despise.

The search for compassion and encouragement and strength to be gained from the heart of Reality is what is back of creeds and cults, behind rituals and sacraments, beneath the techniques of prayer and meditation. These are ways in which the race cries out for help. In respect to them a certain deftness has come into being as the result of ages-old experiment, a deftness quite beyond the usual university man of the moment. He is apt to be crudely inexperienced in his attempts to get at what he needs, babyish in his gropings toward the universal source of strength. His idea of prayer is apt to be magical. He thinks that meditation consists of having an argument with himself. His worship is superficial, sentimental, chock-full of pride. Silence and aloneness are terrible monsters to be escaped from at any cost. Sometimes he becomes blasphemous, sometimes skeptical and indifferent. The tragic thing is that he goes on from youth into maturity unarmed against his own weakness, trying to face up to a life which is almost impossibly difficult, himself vulnerable. Who is responsible for this? The allegedly kindly mother, the university, which does not even inform him that there are such things as mystical techniques, much less teach him the use of them in human behavior.

If these things are indeed so, I concluded, then a

Religious Emphasis Week in which, with official blessing, students are urged to get together and talk about God and the good life like babies in a kindergarten, flounder around in bull sessions, listen to ministerial banalities, watch pageants as trivial as they are pretty, is an evasion and a subterfuge. The learned gentlemen present should get busy right away and demand for themselves and their pupils an approach to religion worthy of what pretends to be a home of higher culture.

With those words I sat down. All over the room faculty members were demanding to speak. I prepared to defend myself, *but they all agreed with me*, including one well-known skeptic who told me afterward that he had come only in order to get material for later waggery at the University Club. Nor was the interest confined to those who were present at the luncheon. I was interviewed and dined for a fortnight by faculty men and women who had not been there that noon but who had heard tales. I was invited by professors to speak in their philosophy classes, their history classes, their English classes, to one class in pure science, always on religion and the good life. Of course nothing came of it really. The great machine went lumbering on its way. The University of Suburbia is at the moment laying plans for next year's Religious Emphasis Week.*

• Not all that has here been said about the American university's indifference to religion and morals applies to Roman Catholic institutions or to some of the rapidly dwindling number of "denominational colleges." They, however, are not without fault, for they almost invariably teach

II

Last December I kept the fortieth anniversary of my receiving the bachelor's degree. At the convocation of my university I was moved to ask a few basic questions of myself: "What is it that has chiefly hampered my generation, sent forth into the world four decades ago, in our search for significance and joy? What is it that my contemporaries have failed to understand and, failing to understand it, have made such a mess of society and too commonly of their individual lives as well? To what extent was our university education responsible for these indubitable failures?"

I am quite sure that the trouble with us has been that we have not seriously and bravely put to ourselves the question "What is man?" or, if and when we have asked it, we have usually been content with answers too easy and too superficial. Most of us were trained to believe—and we have gone on the assumption ever since—that in order to be modern and intelligent and scholarly all that is required is to avoid asking "Why am I?" and immerse oneself in a vast detail of specialized study and in ceaseless activity. We have been so busy going ahead that we have lost any idea of where it is exactly that we are going or trying to go. This is, I do believe, the thing that has ruined the world in the last half century.

that there is only one religion and only one morality, both to be accepted—or else. An appeal to authority apart from reason is not worthy of a university. Still, it is arguable that some knowledge about even one way of living the good life is better than nescience about all religions and all moralities.

It is only another way of saying that my generation has paid not much more than lip service, often not even that, to religion. We have thought of religion as dealing chiefly with curious speculation about Deity, a speculation which has seemed to most of us irrelevant. We have not seen that the basic question it asks is, always has been, always will be a query about man himself, about God only as God may reveal to man his true destiny and, having revealed it, give him the courage to pursue it no matter how great the cost of that pursuit. Religion has seemed to my generation primarily a matter of metaphysical inquiry rather than a matter of vital adventure, and we have found the metaphysics uninteresting. What we have needed to know, as men in every age need to know, is what man may be, must be to avoid heartbreak. Should not our universities have helped us to gain from religion the vision and the fortitude which it has bestowed upon the sons and daughters of men down the ages? It seems to many of us, as we look back across the years, that our cultural training ought to have been devised so that it pointed us toward religion, as well as toward science and the arts, as a means of access to the secret about life. What most of us found in our universities did not do that. In consequence, in spite of skills, in spite even of erudition, we have for the most part lived like blundering babies.

I do not ask that my readers agree with this analysis; but I feel moved to present it as the result of forty years of adult observation and experience. Agree or

not, facts force us to admit at least that the men and women of our generation, left largely to a pursuit of obvious and material ends, perhaps scholarly ends but ends no greater than scholarly, have brought the human race to a state of near chaos and have furnished, even to the affluent and the learned, little that nurtures the inner being of a man. Something was lacking in our training and in consequence has been lacking in our lives. That something was religion. Some of us have been able to discover the disbalance of our age and escape from it during the years since we were graduated; many more of us have not been so fortunate.

Why, I asked myself, did our universities send us forth unprepared to draw upon the eternal friendship and sufficient power of God? Why did they teach us so much that was true and useful but fail us in our deepest need? Why were we not brought face to face with purpose, with dynamic sanity, with a more-than-human strength? I do not ask why our universities did not *convert* us to religion; only realized need can convert any man. But when life began to teach us the need, we did not know how to supply it. Why were we left bemused by an atheism acquired not from the necessities of modern knowledge but from the silence of our nurturing mother? Why were we introduced to a wealth of learning which stressed science and which had at least a bowing acquaintance with the fine arts but which treated religion as negligible? The universities of forty years ago were themselves be-

mused, creatures of a day adrift from meaning. For what my university taught us, I am humbly grateful and always shall be; but I am not grateful that it failed to introduce us to the intellectual respectability and moral necessity of faith. Left unhelped where we needed help the most, the greater part of my generation has drifted into an unwilling and unhappy and perilous alliance with fundamental disorder. This has caused us, to an alarming degree, to deny our destiny; it has prevented our finding peace.

In all the ages, including ours, there is in the world a basic and primary contention between those who say on the one hand that every human being is a son or daughter of the Most High and those who insist on the other that man is only a more canny beast, his noble dreams self-deception and his end the grave. In every generation, and perforce in ours, the God-men strive to realize their innate likeness to Him by whom, for whom, in whom they are aware they were made to live, to labor, to create not so much for pay or human applause as for the glory of God, to sacrifice with joy because they love with no demand on love, to die with triumphant affirmation. Against the God-men stand and always have stood the beast-men, sometimes crude and unlettered in their biodynamics, sometimes erudite and cultured. These deride the God-men, seek to discredit them, oppress them, for they see in their eyes a happiness which the beast-men cannot know, intolerable. The God-men have in all the ages borne witness to their fundamental faith and

still do, not only by word but by deed; it has cost them much to bear that witness. Over and over again they have died at the hands of the beast-men; but by dying they have not ceased to be. The beast-men die and are forgotten.

Ours is a day when the beast-men have risen to a power and a prestige almost unprecedented in history. They seem determined permanently to unhitch, if they can, man's wagon from the stars, to reduce him to the level of the animals—and lower than that, to the level of those glands which react to environmental stimulation. To a startling and alarming degree, the beast-men are in control of almost every aspect of our modern life, *including education*. They work toward the abolition of man as man, toward the reduction of men and women to enslavement by those who through shrewdness or force would manage them, those who would use their fellows for demonic ends. By no means are all the beast-men aware of what they are doing. Karl Marx, for instance, had no idea whatever as he worked away on *Das Kapital* that he was helping to lift into power a Stalin or a Molotov. Many a mild-mannered professor, who goes on being scholarly and scientific but who forgets and fails to give to others a sense of man's high destiny and dignity, is, as C. S. Lewis has lately pointed out,* as truly a foe to humanity as any designing dictator. A university which fails to lift its students to an understand-

* C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1947.

ing of their more-than-animal potentialities, their more-than-erudite potentialities, may be, quite without realizing its own iniquity, a foe to human welfare.

As I look back on my student days across forty years, I realize with a certain resentment that the universities in my day were singularly unaware of this agelong basic struggle between the God-men and the beast-men or else that, knowing of it well enough, they dodged it as disturbing to academic calm. The universities taught about man's behavior *up to a certain point*, but what they taught did not reveal the fundamental fact about his behavior, namely, that man either adores, aspires, dares toward that which is greater than himself or else he becomes bored and then, in reaction against boredom, violent. Maybe it was our fault that we did not learn these things; maybe we were imperceptive. But somehow our university experience convinced most of us that all that matters is the here and now, the expedient. Whether the universities were at fault or we ourselves, this was what we went forth into the world believing.

For better or worse, my generation is now middle-aged. This is not too greatly to be held against us, for there are some things that only mature life can teach and we have learned a few of them, while youth as yet has had small chance to learn them; this is the justification of our claim to be heard. At any rate, a new generation is on the scene. Is it better prepared than we were at its age to understand man's destiny—

the nature of it and the price that must be paid for its fulfillment? Are the universities doing a better job by it than they did by us?

Somehow I doubt it. For the past three decades I have been much in universities up and down the land, always trying to understand, always hoping. Certainly they seem as efficient as they ever were in developing men and women in scholarship linguistic and historical and mathematical and scientific. They may be more efficient in training men and women in dialectic. They seem, perhaps, less effective than they used to be in teaching people how to get on with one another through shared activity. But they are as inept as they were forty years ago in imparting to emerging graduates a knowledge that, however one embodies it in words, the true end of man is to know God and to enjoy Him forever. It may be that at some future time the universities will resume their chief function and deal with universals—not only with universal thought but with universal aspiration and universal spiritual adventure; but that happy day has not yet arrived.

III

I have talked over with any number of educators the neglect of religion shown by our universities and colleges and asked why religion is not taught as a discipline as basic and as respectable as the scientific discipline, the creative discipline, the social discipline. I have pointed out to them that ignorance of religion and religions lessens the human impulse toward en-

durance and daring as well as toward compassion and charity; that it prevents a right valuation of human motives and therefore hinders a sound understanding of history, of sociology, of human behavior in general; that it interferes with appreciation of the arts; that—but it is not necessary to go on. The greater part of those to whom I have spoken do not for a moment deny (1) that the universities and colleges do ignore the powerful and unavoidable character of religion and (2) that by this ignoring they do great harm to their students both as individuals and as builders of a sound society. But, they ask, how can one teach religion in a university committed to no sectarian approach to life or truth? There are many religions. There are many varieties even of Christianity—three hundred or so kinds of Protestants and at least three sorts of Catholics—Roman, Orthodox, Anglican. There are various sorts of Judaism. To no one religion may a university commit itself without constriction of outlook. They say, these conscientious and troubled directors of higher education, that for the sake of peace on the quadrangles and good will among scholars the only wise thing to do is to bar religion altogether from university consideration.* Their fears

* By the same reasoning the universities ought, it would seem, to bar the teaching of philosophy, since philosophers differ among themselves so widely, and history, because of the varying theories held about history; and politics, for fear of offending Democrats or Fascists or Communists, Aristotelians or Kantians; and science, because mechanists and vitalists debate vigorously and often hatefully about the meaning of what has been discovered scientifically. But no, it seems the danger is serious only when we come to religion.

are mostly unreal and unimaginative. I know they are, know it from experience.

In a university college where I once occupied a chair, I was asked by the faculty to look after the freshman class in a year's required course intended to help them relate their religion to the scientific and philosophical disciplines to which they were being introduced; this in order that they might have less difficulty in combining the spiritual and the intellectual. These freshmen came from widely varied backgrounds: Anglican, Lutheran, Protestant of every sort, Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Jewish Orthodox, Jewish Liberal, as well as backgrounds that bade them look upon religion as nothing more than an archaic superstition.

At the end of a year I was compelled to report to my colleagues that what they desired could not be done. The trouble was not that it is impossible, or even difficult, to correlate religion and science and philosophy, but that these students had no religion to relate to anything, at least no religion which involved thinking, no religion about which one could talk intelligently. With rare exceptions, all they possessed in the way of religion was some vague loyalty to an ecclesiastical group—about half of them had this; a number of prejudices, chiefly against communions other than that with which they were vaguely affiliated; a few quaint moral taboos; scarcely more than infantile notions about God; devotional techniques which

rarely went beyond "Now I lay me" and "God bless papa and mama."

One could not tie that sort of thing up to what is arrived at by way of scientific study, or to the arts, or to philosophy. Maybe it would be well, I suggested, if the faculty would permit me first to teach the youngsters, objectively and with no care for what might be their reactions, a little about what religion has always been and still is and about what religious people of the major faiths today believe and do and why they believe and do it. The faculty consented, and for several years the course was taught. Former students write me even yet to express thanks for the help it gave them.

The object of the course was to present, with no attempt to influence the student's belief or disbelief in anything, the basic facts, ideas, and practices back of all religions and, in particular, back of Judaism and Christianity, the religions of the West. The following topics were dealt with seriatim:

1. The concept of supernatural reality: religion as an attempt to find contact with that reality; a review of the development of religion from its vague beginnings in a sense of *manu*, on through fetishism, animism, anthropomorphism, henotheism, to monotheism.

2. The basic concepts back of religious practice: the concept of sin, the concept of salvation by sacrifice, the concept of mystical aspiration, the concept

of prayer (together with something of prayer technique).

3. The development of Judaism from the animism of Genesis through the anthropomorphism of Abraham and the henotheism of Moses to the moralized monotheism of the later prophets; a brief survey of Jewish history as throwing light upon this development; a brief survey of the Old Testament, with comment upon its folklore, legal codes, history, poetry, drama and philosophy.

4. The Christian religion, both as a development from Judaism and as a new thing in its concept of Incarnate God seeking man in response to the search of man for God; the effect of this concept upon the ideas of sin, sacrifice, mystical aspiration, and prayer.

5. The concept of the Church as the mystical body of Incarnate God; reliance upon grace or supernatural help from Christ, the conquering Comrade; the two major and five minor sacraments; the priestly and prophetic ministry.

6. The story of Catholic Christianity to the Reformation: its basis of authority in religion; the definition of doctrine in the fourth and fifth centuries; the growth of the papacy; the schism between East and West; the place of the Church in the medieval world; the significance of monasticism; the weakening of the medieval idea.

7. Protestant Christianity: its basis of authority, the Bible; its relationship to humanism and to the rise of nationality; Luther's principles and those of

Calvin; the wars over definition; the triumphant era of Protestantism; its undermining by Biblical criticism and the development of science. Also the rise of modernism, with the principles thereof. Also the Counter-Reformation in the Roman Church. Also the Anglo-Catholic position.

8. The Christian moral life: its emphasis upon positive rather than negative morality; the conventional analyses of sins—positive and negative, thought, word, and deed, personal and social; the technique of repentance; the Catholic sacrament of penance and its Protestant equivalents; moral growth as a process rather than a sudden achievement.

9. Christian worship: the Catholic sacrifice of the Mass; the ancient offices; the worship of Protestantism; the service of beauty to worship; the more usual vestments and ornaments of worship.

The purpose was merely to make the student cognizant in bare outline of the religious experiment, of some of the things men do to express their aspiration toward God, of how they have formulated their beliefs. The intention was not to convince the student but to inform him. So carefully was this kept in mind that never once was there the slightest indignation at the presentation on the part of Roman Catholics, Anglicans, various kinds of Protestants, Jews. As the course went on the result was usually that each student understood more fully the implications of his own inchoate religion and also came to a fair appreciation of the practices and beliefs of those brought up

in ways different from his own. It deepened conviction and cultivated tolerance.

Most colleges, even when their officials are deeply concerned about the irreligion of the students, seem afraid to face religion thus objectively. Until it is so faced as a part of the race's experience it is not likely that most undergraduate reactions toward it will be anything but sentimental and unhealthy. It is unfortunate that many colleges because of sheer neglect should be sending into society alumni with no religious interests and with large contempt for the mystical life. It is inexcusable that this attitude should be due to sheer timidity.

IV

Whatever be deemed a proper answer to the question of how to restore a sane religious interest to the secularized and therefore lopsided approach to learning and life which characterizes American higher education today, one thing ought to be clear, namely, that the problem is not one of undergraduate incapacity or indifference but rather one of faculty neglect. In respect to religion, as in respect to economics and politics and most other things, the college student by and large takes from his instructors his beliefs and disbeliefs, his likes and dislikes, his notions and his prejudices. There are a few rare souls among undergraduates who question the assumptions and *ipse dixits* of their professors; the vast majority have neither the desire nor the ability to do so. Even the

exceptional ones, the rebels, are far less resistant than they think is the case. It is safe to assume—and to work with undergraduates on the basis of that assumption—that what the faculty thinks the students will think also. Certainly this is the case in respect to religion. Consequently, in seeking to restore in the colleges a diet which will include religion of some sort as a necessity to sound thinking and sane doing, the undergraduates may and should be largely overlooked for the time being and attention concentrated where it rightly belongs, on the administrations and the teaching staffs.

It is also well to note how dependent intellectually the college faculties are upon the graduate and professional schools, upon those who have gone beyond the primary degree, even beyond the doctor's degree. The university college is, for good or ill, an intellectual dependency of the university as a whole, which means, in practice, of its postgraduate sections. I know that this is true at the University of Chicago where for the time being I live and move and have my work. I know from experience that it is true at Columbia. Both Columbia College and Barnard College take their color from the university. It is more plainly true every year that Harvard University is a bigger and more important entity than Harvard College. It is true of Yale. It begins to be true even of Princeton—the most undergraduate of our older universities. It is so in every true university. Even separating the college geographically from most of the rest of the uni-

versity, as at Northwestern, does not destroy the intellectual domination of the college by the more mature sections of the institution. What the whole university is and thinks, that the college imitates, even though, as at the University of Chicago, the authorities of the college would like to have it otherwise; they may to some extent escape from a dictation in teaching methods, but in respect to intellectual "set" their resistance seems to most unbiased observers along the Midway to be ineffective. The plain fact is that by the very nature of a university the collegiate tail cannot wag the university dog.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the many small colleges which are not organic parts of universities also tend to take on the complexion of the post-graduate sections of universities, for the simple reason that such colleges do not train their own teachers. These come to them from the university graduate schools. Even the most illustrious of the minor colleges are intellectual satellites. In respect to attitudes and opinions they too are wagged by the multicaudate universities; they have small motion of their own, less and less as years go on.

In short, the core of any problem having to do with American higher education, including the problem of religion, will be found not in the colleges but in the universities, and, within the universities themselves, not in the undergraduate sections but among the research scholars in the graduate and professional schools.

It seems to many thoughtful observers that all this is curiously overlooked by those who approach the problem of how to get on with, possibly to improve, higher education in respect to religion. Their aim seems rather to be the plausibly laudable one of dealing with the religion of undergraduates as though it could be immunized from the attitudes toward religion which originate at the highest scholarly levels. Nothing could be more unreal. The problem of religion and higher education will never be solved by undergraduate bull sessions or by more deftly led discussion groups as long as these remain extracurricular, extramural. Such religious activities are ignored, politely or scornfully, by those who set the tone of undergraduate thinking, namely, those who teach. A few undergraduates may perhaps be salvaged by direct approach, but while we are saving them from intellectual blind spots many more will be infected by irreligious contagion. What is most needed is to get at the leaders of university administration and thinking, and at the men in the graduate schools who are even now being trained and conditioned to assume academic leadership in the colleges and universities of a decade or so hence.

With this realization we remember once more the University of Suburbia where this chapter began, with its "Religious Emphasis Week," that revealing evasion of intellectual responsibility.

10. Education And Stateism

THE proper business of education is threefold: *first*, to teach people how to labor truly to earn their living, how to do it with a maximum of craftsmanlike enjoyment; *second*, to civilize each oncoming generation by putting at its disposal the wisdom which man has accumulated by experiment and thought down the ages and encouraging reflection thereon; *third*, to train such persons as are competent so to evaluate both past and present as to help their less perceptive brethren toward a clearer understanding of the truth, a more near following of what has always proved and always must prove the significant and satisfying ways of life, toward a more dear evaluation of man; *in brief*, to minister to the common need. What is the common need? The common need is for reverence toward That Which Is and for discipline in the light of what such reverence reveals.

Ideally these three aims should determine education. But, as a matter of fact, educators are interfered with—sometimes more, sometimes less, always to a certain extent—by being forced to attend to a fourth kind of job, which hinders them in the performance of their more important duties.

This fourth job is to keep the general public quiet and tractable while it is being used for the profit and aggrandizement of whatever dominant class happens to be in control of the State. Never more than now has this been so distressfully in evidence. The pressure brought to bear on administrators and teachers to see to it that as few people as possible oppose, or even seriously examine, the principles or lack of principles of the economic-industrial-financial-political powers that happen to be, is serious. To prevent awkward questions, it is demanded that growing youth not delve too deeply into matters of morality but rather exclusively, or nearly so, seek instrumental knowledge of how to produce, how to cooperate in production. An attempt is made to confine social studies to an unquestioning examination and admiration of the politico-economic setup. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that education's chief enemy, as it is the chief danger of human welfare generally, is a conspiracy which demands silence about the competency of the social and political order to secure justice and thus to free men and women to attain their true end.

This conspiracy, usually a silent one, is most harmful in these days. Never in America has nationality, or rather supernationality, imperialism, been regarded with such a combination of carefully cultivated complacency and almost fanatical devotion as in the twentieth century. If one doubts this, let him compare with our usual contemporary patriotism, so-called, the sort of affection, loyalty, commitment to

their country which characterized the American founding fathers, for instance George Washington.

Washington was a man educated in Christian moral philosophy. He was therefore fundamentally an individualist and so at times could be a rebel. Equally, he was a believer in the utility, indeed the necessity if society were to continue, of cooperation between men and between groups of men. It was upon this enlightened combination of willingness to rebel against governmental tyranny and of desire for cooperation among citizens that his patriotic attitudes were built. He knew, as any educated person knows, that government always involves an attempt to reconcile two ambitions of man, ambitions which are in tension against one another: a felt necessity for security and a longing for personal freedom. America was for Washington a place where stalwart individuals might voluntarily assist one another, where they must be compelled to assist one another only if they refused to do so voluntarily.

This was a different brand of patriotism from what ordinarily goes under the label today—far removed from the notion that the State is an entity superior to the citizens who belong to it body and soul, a provider of bread and circuses, demanding unquestioning obedience to those who by hook or crook have managed to wangle themselves into posts of governmental authority; far removed, too, from the idea of a nation as a legitimate agency to gain for its citizens in a competitive world, by force or threat of force, by diplo-

matic double-dealing or howsoever, this, that, or the other illegitimate advantage over other nations. Washington's patriotism was compatible with his being an educated gentleman; there are parts of contemporary patriotism no gentleman can touch without contamination. Politics is always a means toward an end, never an end in itself. To Washington the end was freedom enlarged by cooperation. To many in our time the end is enslavement of the many for the advantage of a controlling class: the proletariat and, more particularly, the Party, in Russia; in America of late, the managerial manipulators for the upper bourgeoisie; in the England of today and possibly in the America of tomorrow, the leaders of organized labor.

The basic conviction of the founding fathers about the function of the State is summed up in the statement in the Declaration of Independence that every human being has inalienable rights to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness. The founding fathers did not stop to argue over this; it was to them self-evident, and they said so. They meant by it precisely what the words signify: that an individual has the right and the responsibility and the bounden duty to live his life as he sees fit, to be free from any sort of external human control, to enjoy himself as best he can, subject only to one limitation, namely, that he shall not prevent the same privilege, opportunity, and obligation of his neighbors. The sole purpose of the State, as the founders of America saw things, the only justification for

government, is to keep people from interfering with one another. A nation exists for the sake of its free citizens and not an enslaved citizenry for the sake of the nation. They were quite sure that the State does not exist apart from or superior to those who make it up. The State seemed to them nothing more than a number of free citizens considered in their relationships to one another. The founding fathers believed that when the State forgets this limitation and begins to regard itself as an end, when those who govern start to interfere with the inalienable rights of the citizens and to regard them as persons to be exploited and controlled, albeit benevolently, in the interest of the State and of whatever class happens to be using the State at the moment for its class advantage, then obligation to be loyal to the State at once disappears.

This is the way the founding fathers looked on their own warfare, the Revolutionary War. The King's government had forgotten the King's subjects and was interfering with their inalienable rights, for the sake of enhancing itself and profiting the British trading class which at that time ran the King's government. This was intolerable, to be resisted to the death. They became rebels, armed rebels against constituted authority. If their resistance had failed, Washington and his friends would have been hanged as traitors. It did not fail, and so we call them noble patriots. It is indeed a superficial observer of such men who cannot see that they would have taken up arms against the new America which they had helped to make, as

quickly and as gladly as ever they fought the British colonial government whose soldiers and civil servants many of them had been, the instant they thought that it intended to coerce its citizens for the sake of enriching or exalting a controlling class. Even the Federalists were believers in rebellion when necessary.

Nowadays we are not for the most part so clear-sighted. People otherwise seemingly intelligent talk and act as though they think our country is not us but something superior to us. We have made a sort of god out of the nation. We have raised it above the moral law. What else can that blasphemy mean which a leading daily newspaper was long accustomed to print each day at the head of its editorial column, the words of a certain bombastic naval officer of a former day: "My country, may she always be right; but right or wrong, my country." Jefferson, Adams, Jay, Hamilton, Washington, had they heard that slogan, would have started to recondition their old muskets.

For a long time now, more and more during the last fifty years, every major nation of the world has gone in for the aggrandizement of the State and of those who govern in the interest of some sort of class control, for the exploitation of the other classes. Less and less questioning has been permitted about the motives of governing groups. The high-minded gentleman who thinks as he pleases, says what he likes, goes his own gait, careful to let others do the same, is not only less and less met with among us but is treated as though he were a wicked creature. The

sacredness of individual liberty is a phrase which sounds archaic. Some of us feel fretful about this, but even those who do are sufficiently the victims of false political theory to be a bit ashamed of our resentment. The notion that our country is superior to ourselves has very largely destroyed our self-respect. Instead of a rational love of our countrymen and an insistence upon our mutual protection of one another's liberties, which is what men like Washington meant by patriotism, instead of a constant emphasis upon the worth and value of each individual person, we have developed the disease called "Stateism," given allegiance to a heresy which bids us obey without question, honor without discrimination an abstraction called "the State," and not question those who happen to have established controls over that State.

Nationalism is to patriotism what a cancer is to healthy flesh. It has engendered in us, in our consideration of national and international problems, a bigoted spirit of fanaticism which will not permit us realistically to face facts domestic or foreign. It has put a premium on conformity which has made the holding of an honest opinion increasingly dangerous. It has taken most of the rich raciness out of living, thought, discussion. It has increased the docility of the masses and made arrogant those in the seats of the mighty. It has made us bellicose, intransigent.

The degradation of patriotism due to class control of the State is to be found in every nation. We have

one kind of class government in America, another in Argentina, another in Russia, and so on; in no country is there government of the people for all of the people. In such a world, nervous to maintain precarious class controls, true patriotism is bound to decay into a morbid nationalism.

The worst result of all this is the promotion of a complacent, insular, conceited, absurd unwillingness on the part of the nations, particularly of the two most powerful nations, Russia and the United States, to cooperate in things of common concern. Such unwillingness begets war. It is particularly inexcusable in the case of America, for our own experience should have taught us better. When the struggle for independence was over there were thirteen sovereign states on our Atlantic seaboard, thirteen distinct little nations. Massachusetts was as truly independent of Virginia or North Carolina as we are today separate from England or France or Spain. Thanks to slow transportation, Boston and Richmond were then farther apart than Chicago and Leningrad are now. It would have been easy for each of these little nations to go its own way, to erect tariff walls against the other states, to live for itself. The founding fathers knew the danger of that. They were for federation. Before Washington died he found himself President of a United States in which each small unit had voluntarily given up some of its sovereign rights in order to cooperate for better things to come. No interstate

tariff walls could be built between them. No one of them might arm against the others. Their common concerns were to be handled by common deliberation. Upon this principle, for the preservation of which the War Between the States had to be fought later on, everything that is great, happy, prosperous in America is built. The same kind of unity, bought by partial surrender of national sovereignty, is possible in world affairs as in our domestic setup; but no great nation will have it. Why? Because, it can hardly be doubted, unrestricted national sovereignty ministers to the profit of whatever class is in control. Russia is unwilling to establish a world republic; such a state would imperil the class welfare of the group which is in control in Muscovy. But so are we unwilling to pay the price for world unity.

Our patriotism, which educators are constantly being told they must cultivate at any cost, is at once too petty and too monstrous; too overgrown for the safety of the citizens and too small in vision to allow the substitution of world cooperation for economic and military wars.

It does not seem necessary to assume, as do Franz Oppenheimer and Albert Jay Nock and quite a respectable number of other political theorists, that the State, whenever it goes beyond a negative role in government, the role of umpire and peace preserver, becomes a racket deliberately set going by insiders who manage to preempt land and the control of natural resources and who organize politically to keep

fast hold on their ill-gotten privilege,* but it is undeniable that political history is largely a record of brigandage in state after state, brigandage by a few who have been entrenched in power over the masses, brigandage maintained until revolution has dislodged the brigands. The revolutions have resulted in the installation of new groups, new classes in the places of authority, and then of the corruption of these new groups by cupidity and conceit. Out of revolution has come new oppression, which in its turn has had to be overthrown. There is no dodging the fact that the stronger the State has been and the more manifold its controls over industry, commerce, agriculture, transportation, the more sure and speedy has been the reduction of the many to a servile condition, their enslavement by an oligarchy responsible to the holders of special privilege. Nor can anyone doubt that, as H. L. Mencken has said,† in every modern land:

The State has taken on a vast mass of new duties and responsibilities; it has spread out its powers until they penetrate to every act of the citizen, however secret; it has begun to throw around its operations the high dignity and impeccability of a religion, its agents become a separate and superior caste, with authority to bind and loose, and their thumbs in every pot.

* One of the best examples of this opinion is given in Albert Jay Nock, *Our Enemy the State*, William Morrow & Company, Inc., New York, 1935. The charge that the State is a racket may be leveled as truly at Russia as at America, as truly at America as at Russia.

† Quoted in Albert Jay Nock, *Our Enemy the State*.

It is hard, in short, to avoid the following convictions: that the whole world is today suffering from statecraft prostituted to carry on ignoble and unjust class exploitations; that our own country is no exception to this; that all round the world the puffing up of government to unprecedented power is sure to result sooner or later in an honest-to-goodness explosion, a revolution nihilistic and anarchic beside which our present social disturbances, waged between various groups of would-be exploiters each entrenched in its imperialistic or nationalistic setup, will seem like a game of tin soldiers. The State may not be a racket, but it is at least an easy instrument for racketeers.

II

Those in control of statecraft know, sometimes consciously and more often subconsciously, that an explosion will come when people start asking too many simple questions about the nature of man and the ends he should pursue for satisfaction and happiness and about the function of government in furthering this pursuit. Because such questions are dangerous, it is in the interest of the State and of whatever exploiters control it—proletarian or bourgeois, Communist or Fascist, democratic or whatever—to prevent the upgrowing generation (or perhaps if not prevent it at least distract it) from asking such questions and making some shocking discoveries. In order to insure the *status quo* for statesmen and for those

whose class interests statesmen represent, the State must see to it that education is state-controlled and state-denatured. To avoid unrest and eventual rebellion, the State finds it more and more necessary to manage education, as far as possible to monopolize education. This manipulation only puts off the evil day and makes it the more terrible when it does arrive. Truth will prevail in the end. Stateism may provide safety for the *status quo* up to a point but only up to a point, for Stateism breeds war, which ends all security.

Blind to this eventual necessity or at any rate insensitive to it, the State seeks to control education—and never in the interest of freedom. Wise or foolish, those who manipulate the State seek to dehumanize education, to reduce it to an instrumental level, to prevent it from too close scrutiny of governmental ends and aims. So it has always been when states grow superstrong. There is no reason to suppose that in this respect things are different now from what they have been in the past; indeed, all the available evidence points plainly to the fact that there has been no change of mind.*

* In this connection we may note the ironical remark of Chancellor Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago. "A university president who is suspected of an interest in morals, in intellect, or even in education deserves the severest condemnation from those who have the true interests of our country at heart." *Education for Freedom*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, La., 1943.

Also worth consideration is Oliver Martin's conclusion about the new trends that find embodiment in *General Education in a Free Society*, the so-called "Harvard Plan" (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.,

It is now clearly high time that we realize that academic freedom, freedom to seek after the truth, is threatened by no other source as it is by organized secular government. There was a day when the Church stifled freedom in education, independence in thinking, in the interest of preserving its class control over government and over life under government. That day is long past. The rising secular State protested against the ecclesiastical strangle hold, protested valiantly and successfully. Having thus ousted its chief rival, however, it began to establish its own strangle hold over education, always in the interest of whatever class happened to control. The Church has continued to act educationally, by competition and by criticism seeking to curb the State's expanding coercion; but in every land, including America, its influence for freedom in education has grown less and less. More and more the State has become all-controlling, directly so over the public schools and public universities—indirectly and by heavily subsidized

1945). After pointing out that under the new plan no priority is given to philosophy, particularly not to morals, but rather that the centralizing idea seems to be the promotion of business and industrial efficiency, after noting that the apparent intent is to mobilize our academic brains "infused with a zeal to move American society along its historic road"—whatever that may mean, Dr. Martin remarks that on this basis there soon will be "no universities, only their physical plants, no education, only propaganda. Nor will there be any terrible metaphysicians, nor 'psychoneurotics' who love wisdom, nor philosophers to juggle such abstract notions as reason and justice—for by that time the more consistent and brutal realism of Thrasymachus will have supplanted the respectable sophistry of Protagoras." *Two Educators. Hutchins and Conant*, Henry Regnery Company, 1948.

competition over those universities and schools, religious and not so religious, which operate independently. In education today, whatever may have been the case in times past, it is not the Church which threatens educational liberty, freedom of thought. On the contrary, the Church is often almost their only champion. It is the State which is the enemy of that academic freedom which, as Nicholas Murray Butler rightly said, is education's "instrument for knowing the changing world, for aiding the changing world, for shaping the changing world." * At all costs, state control of education must be reduced, not strengthened, if we are to have a free society competently led toward human ends.

But at the moment it is increasingly difficult for education to resist further state encroachments on academic freedom and self-determination, for the simple reason that the State, because it alone can tax, has become the only entity financially able to pay for education. In the lower schools and in the high schools the State has acquired an ever-growing domination. In 1944 90 per cent of all teachers in such schools were paid out of public funds; only 10 per cent were dependent on other than the state for their daily bread.† In the case of colleges and universities, the private institutions hold their own better; but even here it is interesting to note that, in spite of large

* Nicholas Murray Butler, *The Obligation of Universities to the Changing World*, New York University Press, New York, 1933, p. 473.

† Figures furnished by John Dale Russell of the United States Office of Education.

benefactions to such institutions down the years and today, \$123,400,000 was received in 1944 for the support of higher education by state-supported institutions as against \$142,500,000 by institutions dependent on other sources of income than the public till.*

The public lower schools and high schools are almost wholly supported from *local taxes on real and personal property*. These taxes in a superindustrialized country like our own, where income depends on more than real-estate investment, are not and cannot be productive of enough revenue to run the schools. In consequence, the public schools are overcrowded and their buildings often in bad repair, the teachers grossly underpaid, the whole enterprise limping financially. Hence there is more and more demand for *subsidies from the Federal Treasury*, which can raise the necessary money by way of income taxes, profits taxes, corporation taxes, and so on. As for the state universities, they are almost wholly dependent on other than local levies; they are now financed out of state-wide taxation, and yet even they are forced to cry aloud for aid from Washington.

Meanwhile the private schools and colleges, with the exception of those run by the Roman Catholic Church or maintained by some of the Lutheran synods, and with the further exception of a few heavily endowed private institutions like Harvard and Yale

* These figures are an estimate based on a sample of two hundred institutions, and are taken from *How Shall We Pay for Education?*, Seymour E. Harris, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

and Chicago and Phillips Exeter and Milton—and even these are constantly crying for more money—are facing a financial stringency so great as to hinder them from effective work and in many cases to imperil their existence. All of them feel the strain. Northwestern cries out that it must have \$167,000,000 of new money, and Columbia \$100,000,000—and not for luxuries either, just to attend to legitimate and unavoidable responsibilities. Bowdoin wishes \$3,000,000, Swarthmore wants \$5,000,000, Williams is begging for \$2,500,000; and so it goes everywhere. Even Harvard is asking for \$90,000,000. It is conservatively estimated that our colleges and universities alone, leaving out of consideration the high schools and the grammar schools, to replace buildings worn out and unreplaced during the depression before World War II and during that war and to care for their constantly increasing enrollments, will require in the next ten years no less than five billion dollars. Nowhere is the plight of education more vividly described than by Seymour E. Harris in his book *How Shall We Pay for Education?* He is a professor of economics at Harvard. He says * that institutions of learning will no longer be able to depend, as in the past, upon large gifts and income from endowment, for the following reasons:

1. The rate of interest is substantially lower than in the twenties and is not likely to rise substantially.

* Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay for Education?*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

2. Taxes take an increasing share of incomes, particularly of the high incomes, the main source of gifts to universities.

3. An anticapitalist trend, which in the prosperous years since 1940 has been somewhat dormant, is likely to reveal itself again once depression envelops the country.

4. Inflationary pressures over the years are likely to be much stronger than in the hundred years preceding World War II. Labor, agriculture, and business are all well organized, and in large part to keep prices up.

Mr. Harris sensibly concludes that there will need to be more dependence on tuition fees, but that this too will be inadequate because such fees have already been substantially raised and are even now too high to insure a democratic spread of education.* He goes on to recommend that educational institutions spend whatever gifts are made to them for current expenses instead of investing them in endowment. To invest money in the hope of living off the increment thereof is now a dangerous procedure not only for individuals but also for educational corporations. "From 1928-1929 to 1945-1946 Harvard's investments rose by \$68,000,000, or two-thirds. Yet the university's

* The tuition fee at Yale is now \$600 a year, and living expenses in New Haven, for minimum decency, are at least \$700 a year more—\$1300 in all, which is prohibitive for most students and for their families. At the University of Illinois, where tuition is nearly free, a student must find at least \$650 a year for living expenses. In 1948 New York University increased its fee 15 per cent to \$500, which Chancellor Chase then said is as much or maybe more than the traffic can bear without a falling off in enrollment. (*The New York Times*, Apr. 7, 1948, p. 27.) Columbia University raised its fee in 1948 33½ per cent, because it had to if it was to avoid serious deficit, and in consequence met with student protest of near-riot proportions.

income from investments (in goods value) is no larger now than it was in 1928-1929; the potential gains from a rise in endowment have been spilled in rising prices and falling yield." * The same holds true everywhere today; and who can say what tomorrow will be like? It would make much better sense, Mr. Harris thinks, to spend the principal of gifts received and let future needs be supplied by the future. But it will not be enough to increase tuition fees or to spend the principal of such gifts as are procured. *Private institutions and public institutions alike are already dependent and will continue to be increasingly dependent on direct grants from local, state, and Federal governments, particularly from the last of these since it alone has sufficient power of taxation. Like it or not, this is the inexorable and unavoidable fact.*†

As the Chancellor of New York University pointed out, in his interview with *The New York Times* on April 7, 1948, already quoted, it is within the realm of possibility that the government will not be able to

* Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay for Education?*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948

† The Advisory Committee on Education, made up of representatives of labor, industry, agriculture, home economics, and education, reported in 1938 to President F. D. Roosevelt that exhaustive study plainly showed that much greater financial assistance must be given by the Federal government for support of education, particularly to states lacking in taxable resources, if a program suited to the needs of a modern democracy is to be set up and continued in this country. The same conclusion was even more emphatically reached in Vol. V of the *Report* of the President's (Truman's) Commission on Higher Education in 1947. There can be no dispute about the fact; Federal support is indispensable.

provide the necessary subsidies for the support of education, at least not to any considerable extent, if preparations for war must continue on the present scale or on an enlarged scale, most certainly not if war actually does come. In that last case we might as well stop talking about the future of a modern and democratic education in America. It, like all other evidences of a true civilization, will cease to be, and we shall be back in a period of relative barbarism, with the kind of education which alone is possible in such an age; such discussion as we are having in this book will become purely academic and unreal. One must go on planning on the assumption that the human race is not going to go entirely mad. This is, of course, a questionable assumption.

What effect is a necessary and increasing dependence on Federal aid having and going to have on academic freedom and integrity?

Now that the churches seem to have been pretty well tamed (or at least so politicians think), the one force that still has a possibility of standing out against the growth in the United States of an increasingly irresponsible and more and more totalitarian type of society, an unmoral and expeditious society, a society run by demagogues for the preservation of the privilege and profits of their "good friends," is our schools and colleges and universities. Now is the time of times for politicians to wield the power of the purse and turn these universities and colleges and schools from guardians of freedom into purveyors of directed

propaganda. Here comes education, desperate, holding out its starving hands for help. Who pays the piper calls the tune.

Are we to suppose that if and as the State makes available the necessary money for education the politicians will refrain from dictating what is to be taught and what is not to be taught, how it must be taught and how it must not be taught? Are we to suppose that able administrators and wise teachers and competent scholars will be retained even when their ideas and procedures and speeches and writings differ from the prejudices of the predominating group in Congress, especially when that predominating group, as is common nowadays, is organized on a bipartisan basis? Are we to suppose that the books to be studied will not be censored, overtly or by indirection? Are we to suppose that red tape and a self-feeding and self-perpetuating bureaucracy will somehow be absent from politically created and politically manned and politically supported educational departments and boards and commissions? Our record as a misgoverning and misgoverned people makes such pious suppositions a little unreasonable *; nor is observation of our present school boards in local communities or of the regents

* "A review of the history of Federal grants for educational purposes warrants the generalization that, as the amount of Federal funds has increased, the Federal controls over the programs that are supported by these funds have also increased" Russell and Judd, *The American Educational System*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1940

The authors are not arguing for or against Federal grants or controls; they are merely stating a fact.

of our state universities reassuring. In proportion as education accepts governmental aid—be it repeated, it will have to accept it or go out of business—it must expect an effort to establish political domination, not all at once but here a little and there a little, until the system is brought to heel. Some of the educators who venture to protest can be bought up with flattery, with government jobs where necessary; others will have to stop being educators and get into the ranks of the unemployed; more will just shut their mouths and take orders: they have themselves and their old mothers and their wives and children to feed.

There would seem to be one way, and probably only one, to prevent governmental control and political operation of our schools and colleges and universities once they are state-supported, to prevent a consequent emasculation of education, to prevent the easier enslavement of our people through educational agencies. That one way would be immediately and with determination to organize the million and more teachers of America, together with such of the general public as can be persuaded to join in, to resist even the slightest attempt on the part of the State to interfere with freedom of educational self-determination or with the right of any group to run schools and to receive its share of public assistance as long as that group meets pedagogic standards set for all schools alike; to demand that local school boards be selected by persons of educational knowledge and not by a mayor, city council, or state legislature; to insist that

state education boards be selected only by skilled educational administrators; to require that if we are to have a national Department of Education its members be appointed with consent of the profession and not arbitrarily by the President or by Congress. In other words, if we are to be delivered from an all-too-imminent slavery, we must see to it that the teaching profession functions together with at least as much independence and hardheaded common sense as the American Medical Association or the American Bar Association or the CIO or Mr. Lewis's coal miners.

Will there be any such resisting, demand, insistence, requirement made by a united teaching profession? There could be, but will there be? If such a thing happens, I for one will be the most surprised man in seven counties. I know pedagogues too well to expect any such courage or unity among them. There is little fight in them. It is not due to the stars that they are impotent in time of crisis. Still—one can hope; sometimes miracles happen.

11. First Steps in Reformation

THIS book has tried to point out not the virtues of American education, which are considerable, but rather its faults—basic faults which result, in spite of the virtues, in immaturity of our culture and thought, an immaturity increasingly evident as year follows year, an immaturity that endangers the social structure and prevents a reasonable amount of happiness for Americans individually as well as weakens and undermines the nation. The intention of the book, as was stated at the start, has been to disturb complacency: if possible to wake up the citizenry to the fact that they and their children are being provided with a low-grade education which pretends to be first-class; perhaps to make our educators a little ashamed of themselves. But to find fault is not quite enough. No one has a right to point out mistakes and insufficiencies without suggesting at least a few steps which he is persuaded may be taken toward correcting the errors, supplying the lacks.

To do that is in this instance unusually difficult. Education is something which develops not *in vacuo* but in a society, in a culture into which the schools and colleges and universities are caught up. Some-

times observers of education do not remember this. They suppose that administrators and teachers can mold a civilization to their will. The opposite is far more true: that the desires of the citizens generally bring almost irresistible pressure on school people to train children—and adults—toward the fulfillment of those ends which are vulgarly esteemed valuable, to do little more than that. If the commonly valued ends are inadequate, if they are subhuman or worse, it is little the schools can do to save society. When the wise man sets out to restore through the schools life lived in terms of really human pursuits, he does well to realize that he can succeed only to a limited degree, that he can succeed at all only if he is willing to pay the price that society exacts from those who oppose the expectations of the customers: the taxpayers, the parents, the children themselves. It is hard to see how any improvement worth mentioning can come to our society as long as educators are wholly the obedient servants of the Common Man. But to an extent there can be at least some betterment of the American pattern through the agency of the schools. With no notion that by way of the simple and immediate reforms which I am about to suggest any radical improvement will come about and yet with a feeling that something might thus be better done, even though only in a preliminary way, I set down a few things which seem to me to deserve immediate attention.

I

The first of these I have already mentioned, at the close of the preceding chapter. *The teaching profession must be organized more widely and more definitely than it now is, to see to it that the public is aroused, first of all, to insist on adequate financial support of education and, secondly, to resist all political control, all attempts to transform the schools, colleges, and universities into agencies for the spreading of government-devised propaganda.*

At present we spend a pitiable amount on education, less than 1 per cent of national income. One per cent more is spent by our people for reading matter: books, magazines, newspapers, which may be regarded by the optimistic as money used for education. Add the two items together, and we get, at the very outside, 2 per cent of national income expended on things of the mind plus academic training. We spend far more on luxuries. A survey made in 1941 showed that the average family had then an income of \$1,905. The average family expenditure for automobiles was \$171, for recreation, \$69; for tobacco, \$35; for reading material, \$16; for education, \$15. Professor S. E. Harris, who cites these figures, sensibly concludes that "in the light of large increases in luxury expenditures generally and the small rise in expenditures for education over these years, it is difficult to take at its face value the statement frequently

made that Americans cannot afford to pay more for education." *

They can pay more, but they will pay more only when it is taxed out of them. It is a curious characteristic of the usual contemporary American that he will contribute little or nothing voluntarily toward the support of social services: for health, for safety, for education; that he prefers to waste his substance not in riotous living but in fripperies and amusements; that because he has been taught it, he assumes that government will provide and pay for the social services. To that extent almost all our people, including some of the most Tory Republicans, are Socialists. Governments politically chosen and seeking reelection usually give to the social services according to the intensity of popular pressures, not according to surveyed need. If education is to get the money it must have (or else continue to be the anemic thing it is), the educators must shout long and lustily and get as many other people as possible, especially parents, to shout with them long and lustily until their voices are heard in every town meeting, city or county council, state legislature, the Congress in Washington.

But at the very same time that it cries for money enough to do its important job, the profession, again with the secured backing of enlightened parents,

* Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay for Education?*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

must resist firmly all attempts on the part of political persons and boards to control its policies and personnel. Otherwise, as was said in the preceding chapter, education will soon become only an agency for the entrenchment in privilege of whatever class happens to dominate the State.

The natural instrument for this dual insistence would seem to be the National Education Association, which as yet, if one considers its possibilities, has scarcely begun to function. One of the first things it should demand is the setting up of a national Department of Education within the government, its head a member of the Cabinet and a person as agreeable to the N.E.A. as the Secretary of Labor must be to organized labor. Its lesser officers should without exception be put under civil service. With such a department as this, the N.E.A. could do business effectively, not only for the good of teachers but for the common good. Similar departments could be created—and would be if the teachers insisted upon it—in every state and county and city and village and hamlet; and the unit of the N.E.A. in these vicinities, working in close cooperation with the national office of the N.E.A., could effectively keep crying up and down the land the twofold demand, "More money from taxation for education!" and "Keep political controls out of the schools!" Thus to insist upon support and freedom, both at the same time, will sound like heresy to the usual American statesman; but for all that, the thing is a necessity, quite as much a necessity in the

United States as in Great Britain, where the battle for support and freedom at the same time has largely been won.

II

We need to recognize that there is an inexcusable waste of student time involved in our system of schooling as now organized. Formal education takes entirely too long.

The waste injures, first of all, those who are going on to the professions: medicine, the law, business administration, diplomacy and consular service, education, forestry, agriculture, research in science, and the rest. Consider for example the young American of today who desires to become a medical doctor. After leaving high school at eighteen years of age, he must go four years to college, then four years to a medical school (if it is a good one), then two years to an internship. By the time he is through with all this and ready to begin work, he is twenty-eight years old. Then—and probably not until then—he can get busy, settle down, marry. About the same amount of time should be required in the other professions.

The waste also hurts those who are going into business, industry, finance. These should have, and the best of them demand, four years in college, after which they must get jobs and learn how to handle themselves in terms of their jobs. This takes four or five years more. They too are well on toward thirty before

they can function competently. Even young men and women who desire to learn a trade, if they are to have anything of a general education, are in their twenties before they are ready for apprenticeship.

This is obviously too long a time to spend on education apart from self-support and self-expression; and it is unduly extravagant for the country as a whole to support out of labor so many people for so many years. In consequence, the tendency has been to telescope the college and technical or professional training, with resulting restriction in the amount and adequacy of general education for citizenship and for a rich and rational enjoyment of living. When we bemoan the too utilitarian nature of our colleges and to some extent of our high schools, we might have grace to remember that this is largely forced on them by sheer pressure to get the students out and about their business at a reasonable age. If we are to have both general education and vocational training—and obviously we need them both—we must avoid all possible waste and duplication from the beginning to the end of our system.

Most observers are sure that the major waste is in the elementary schools and high schools. How to remedy this will require a great deal of study on the part of experts who are not hindered by the inertia of things as they are. It would even now seem possible and worth while to divide our schools somewhat differently from the way they are traditionally divided in the United States. The usual method is:

a. Eight years of grammar school, ages six through fourteen

b. Four years of high school, ages fifteen through eighteen

c. Four years of college, ages nineteen through twenty-two

d. Three or four years of professional training, ages twenty-three through twenty-five or twenty-six.

Instead of this it is suggested that we set up:

a. Six years of grammar school, ages six through twelve

b. Four years of intermediate school, ages thirteen through sixteen

c. Three years of college, ages seventeen through nineteen

d. Four years of professional- and technical-school training, ages twenty through twenty-three

The new grammar school should be required to teach in six years all that the grammar school now takes eight years to give. No other nation encourages its teachers and pupils to fool around the way ours do "in the grades."

The four-year intermediate school (call it "high school" if you will, but the term has gained an aroma of undisciplined adolescence, of ridiculous pretension to social prematurity, which makes it an unfortunate name for anything that wishes to be regarded as a real school) should complete the training,

begun lower down, in the skills necessary for reading, writing, arithmetic, accuracy in sensory observation; should enable pupils to go on into algebra, geometry, history, the study of nature; should expose them to contact with the best in arts and letters.

At the end of the intermediate school, at about sixteen, those who cannot or will not profit further by intellectual disciplines should be directed into special schools which can develop them on manual lines plus civilize them by more but very much simplified study of literature, of history, of scientific principles and techniques.

The rest of the pupils should go on through the college for three years, years devoted to dialectical and humanistic studies plus first steps in acquiring the techniques (laboratory and otherwise) which will be used in later professional training. Even if these techniques are never used in the years to come, they are worth while because they have distinct disciplinary value.

Then the professional or technical schools should take over for four years.

About three years would be saved by the redistribution suggested; two in grammar school and one later on. Equally important, *everyone who has the ability could afford time to get both general and vocational education.* The present scandalous (one is tempted to say "criminal" and would except that the fault is caused by incompetence rather than malice) throwing

away of precious time and cultivation of lazy habits in thought and action would exist no more.

A radical redistribution of school time—this or some other—is imperative, and quickly.*

* One institution of learning in the United States more than others has recognized and tried to deal with the necessity for a new and more realistic arrangement in the successive stages of education—the University of Chicago, with its "College" and "Divisions."

The College at Chicago is entered normally at age sixteen, on graduation from a junior high school or after two years in an old-line high school. Only highly competent candidates are admitted; others are expected to stay at home and go on through the usual senior high school, maybe through the conventional and, Chicago thinks, pedestrian junior college, or even the almost equally jog-trot senior college common in America. After four years of rigorous training in dialectic and in the basic substance of the humanities, the social sciences, mathematics and the natural sciences, the bachelors' degree is conferred, normally at about age twenty, on such as can pass rigorous comprehensive examinations in the three fields; and college days are over. Only those are encouraged to go farther who have definite and specialized objectives. Up to this point the student has followed a rigid, inflexible, and difficult discipline in thinking and in general knowledge. Now he enters the Divisions, the University proper, where his specialization at once begins. After three years, normally at age twenty-three, he receives the M A degree and, if he wishes, after two years more, the Ph.D. degree at about age twenty-five.

Much as one who observes the Chicago situation may admire the general result, there is a certain inevitable trepidation at the thought of boys and girls of sixteen and seventeen being plunged into university life and left to sink or swim on their own in almost entire freedom from other than intellectual supervision. The results, social and personal, are often pathetically ludicrous, more than occasionally tragic, almost always an unnecessary burden to the student. Unless there is a revision of the College in this respect the whole experiment may come a cropper; those in midadolescence are not adults and cannot with justice to themselves be treated as adults. A good many people in charge at Chicago recognize this but not all; for some it is hard to admit that boys and girls are not made into men and women merely by following a sound curriculum.

Nor, to be sure, does the Chicago arrangement save much time. It does

III

We must make it possible for highly competent students of low income or from low-income families to go on with their education through high school, college, graduate or professional school at public expense, and this without expectation that they take time off from their studies to support or partially support themselves by gainful employment.

In this respect England is more realistic, at least above the secondary-school level, more "democratic," than we in the United States. For years England has had a system of county scholarships—the counties more or less correspond to our states. Anyone about to be graduated from a secondary school may take the carefully devised examination for a scholarship. If he shows considerable intellectual promise he receives an annual grant sufficient to cover, at the university or professional school of his choice, all fees, lodging and board expenses, clothing, even a reasonable amount of fun. He gets a lump sum ranging from

insure, however, that by age twenty-five the student has had an opportunity, much larger than is usual in this country, to get rigorous training in how to think, a sound general education, and competent graduate-school training

If the College can be in some way better controlled socially, perhaps geographically segregated, and if the scheme can be preëd by more rapid, more sound work in elementary school and junior high school, the University of Chicago arrangement will be even more valuable than it is, though *only for competent students*

The suggestion offered in the text is not by any means the only one which, if followed, might do the trick, there are those who think it has merit. At all events the 8-4-4-3 division which now prevails in the United States is wasteful, ineffective, perpetuated chiefly by inertia and timidity.

about a thousand to sixteen hundred dollars or so a year and can spend it as he desires. The only requirement is that he shall continue to do first-rate work in his university or other higher school.

"Do you expect the recipients of these sums to repay them later on?" I asked an examiner for Hampshire.

"Of course not," he replied. "The grants are an investment for the nation's future leadership and effectiveness."

"And how many scholarships are awarded annually?"

"As many as there are young men and women who can show us that they have the necessary brains."

Oxford and Cambridge are commonly regarded in America as attended by the sons and daughters either of the nobility or of the economically privileged; as a matter of fact, a large proportion of those studying on the Cam and the Cher are poor men's children, supported by county scholarships. The same is true of the younger universities.

Of late Great Britain has come to recognize more and more that a similar arrangement ought to be made for bright but poor children in secondary schools; that there should be grants sufficient to pay, when needed, a child's share of family living expenses as well as his fees, so that he may go on with his studies and give his whole time to them. Take, for instance, the following recommendation to the (national) Board of Education: "We recommend that

the Board of Education should ensure and secure maintenance allowances and other aids to pupils in grant-in-aid secondary schools sufficient to prevent children from being withdrawn prematurely solely on economic grounds; and that when fees in secondary schools are abolished and when families' or children's allowances are in operation, the Board should ensure some supplement to these aids if experience shows such to be necessary." * This recommendation is being followed in postwar educational reorganization.

We are not yet so wise. Often our state or municipal universities do, it is true, provide free or nearly free tuition, and almost all our secondary schools are of the free-tuition type; but tuition fees are a small part of the cost of education to pupils and their families. We still handicap the poor man's sons and daughters. It is conservatively estimated that going on beyond the high school is financially possible only for one in three really bright children of parents whose family income is less than twenty-five hundred dollars; for one in two whose family income is between three and five thousand dollars; for one in one whose family income is over seven thousand dollars. They do not all go, of course, from the higher income group, but it can be wangled when desired.

Moreover, those who matriculate in higher education are often forced to drop out for financial reasons. Just before the war this was true of 12 per cent of

* *Teachers and Youth Leaders*, Board of Education, H M. Stationery Office, London, 1944.

students who entered our colleges. It is also true that many high-school students, often the brighter ones, must leave school because their parents cannot afford to keep them longer from gainful labors. Such cases are most frequent in states where wages are low but in which, thanks to the oneness of our national setup, the cost of living mounts at a rate almost equal to that in more affluent commonwealths.

Even when bright students do not have to drop out of high school and college, frequently they are forced to support or partly to support themselves while studying by all sorts of time-wasting and energy-consuming part-time labor: waiting on table, stoking furnaces, baby sitting, taxi driving, all kinds of jobs. So general is this practice that Americans have rationalized it and find, or pretend to find, great virtue in the business. As a matter of fact, it is at least 90 per cent vicious. Study in high school or beyond ought to demand full-time effort; if it does not, the standards need to be raised. The strain of self-support while studying is often inhuman. I know a graduate law student, for instance, in one of our foremost universities who last year, in order to make both ends meet, worked seven hours a night, seven nights a week, at a hotel desk. The double duty—this and his studies—broke his health, and he had to quit the university for a year in order to recover his nervous equilibrium. His is a not unheard-of case. Even those who do not break under strain often do inferior work and frequently injure their health so that they pay heavily

later on, all their lives, with nervous indigestion or worse. Such nonsense is not only wasteful of brain power; it is a handicap to the leadership of tomorrow.

It is hard not to agree with S. E. Harris who, after study of the facts, statistical and otherwise, concludes that “. . . the loss of talent is serious. . . . We need not only free schools for all and tuition subsidies for the talented in colleges; we also need aid to finance the upkeep of those who show talent or promise at all ages.” * *We should, as a matter of investment for the public welfare, adequately support men and women who show evidence of superior brain power. Only thus can we really equalize and democratize educational opportunity.*

How high a standard of intelligence is it profitable to subsidize publicly? Professor Ralph W. Tyler of the University of Chicago thinks we should certainly look after at least the top 1 per cent, since from it will come the persons most capable of productive and creative research.† This is not enough. Excellent work is done, indispensable work, by those who are not supergeniuses. The British way is good: fix no percentage and do not place entire reliance on intelligence quotients; whenever a boy comes along who by examination shows high promise of achievement and who has need, provide him with money enough to cover tuition and upkeep on a modest but decent

* Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay for Education?*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1948.

† *Ibid.*

level; see to it that he continues to enjoy this assistance as long as he continues to do first-rate work; do the same for the bright girl; and see to it also that public money is not wasted on the higher education of those who are mediocre or worse.* *Refuse to finance those who are not competent, forbid students to "work their way through," adequately provide for those who are able scholastically, and the standards of achievement will rise overnight.*

IV

Forbid by law the assigning at any stage of schooling of more than twenty-five pupils to a teacher. It is impossible really to teach more pupils than that. This is an entirely proper demand made by the better educational associations. But if we satisfy it we must have, for the same number of pupils as at present, at least 25 per cent more teachers than now. Where do we get them? Whence do we pay them?

V

We must enlist, train, and sustain both more teachers and much more able teachers than we now have, and this at every level. The teaching profession is demanding more pay. Of the justice of this insistence, more in a moment or two. First let us ask if the teachers

* If the mediocre or worse have money of their own to waste or their parents and friends are foolish enough to furnish it, let them go to high school or college or beyond as long as the authorities of these various places of resort will tolerate their presence; but let them do it at their own charges.

that we have at present, taking them by and large, are worth more than we pay them. The answer is that for the most part they are not.* Many of them have not had an education, either general or professional, sufficient for effective teaching.†

The average four-year college course given in American colleges and universities does not encompass an impressive amount of "higher" education, measured by, say, British standards. But only fifteen American states out of the forty-eight require a college degree for teachers; and more than half of all the teachers in the country have none. Over 6 per cent of American public-school teachers have had no training beyond high school; 35 per cent have had less than two years of post-high-school training; and over 14 per cent hold sub-standard certificates, indicating incapacity to meet even the minimum requirements of their states . . . and it is certainly no sign of progress that the average American teacher today has less college education than the average of five years ago.

Even when we recognize these low-qualification standards, however, almost any unprejudiced observer will admit that our teachers are not paid enough to live on. They were underpaid before the war; they are worse underpaid today. Between 1939 and 1948 the

* "The supply of well-qualified teachers has always been insufficient to meet the demands. Under such circumstances it has been difficult to maintain standards for certification of teachers, and thousands of persons have been certified, in many cases granted teachers' certificates for life, who are not at all well qualified for the positions they hold." Russell and Judd, *The American Educational System*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1940.

† Dorothy Thompson, "Education and Civilization," *Ladies' Home Journal*, October, 1947, p. 11.

general cost of living rose about 55 per cent; the pay of teachers, in spite of an estimated increase of three hundred fifty million dollars in 1947-1948 over 1946-1947, has gone up only about 25 per cent. Stipends will have to be raised at least a further billion dollars if we are to establish a wage for teachers of from twenty-five hundred to six thousand dollars a year, a reasonable and not extravagant remuneration.

The low pay now prevailing is the largest factor in preventing the enlistment of the proper kind of women in teaching, and it prevents most men from even thinking of teaching except in university positions; it also hinders the continuance of qualified persons in the profession. But there are other deterrents beside low pay.

There is also insecurity of tenure. In most parts of the country teachers in grammar schools and high schools are "hired" year by year, their competence judged and sentence rendered annually by local school boards made up for the most part of popularly elected persons inexperienced in pedagogy and subject to political pressure and to even less reputable forms of social prejudice. Even in higher education there is insecurity for those under the rank of associate professor, which means for the greater part of every college staff.

Another hindrance to our getting enough competent teachers is the common feeling that teaching is not a profession of dignity, not a learned profession,

only a sort of hack trade which receives little public honor, honor such as might help make the low pay endurable.

There is also the irksome difficulty, widely known, of a teacher's having to deal with undisciplined children. A schoolmistress whom I knew to be experienced and able, living in the Far West, a master of arts from a good university, once wrote me that at the age of thirty-five, after ten years' service in a public junior high school, she had abandoned the profession and taken a position selling blouses for a jobbing firm. I protested at the change and asked if she were doing it in the hope of more money. She replied, "Not at all. I lose my pension rights; besides, I am not sure I shall make more in the new work. The truth is that I could not stick it any longer. I could not face the thought of being insulted for another year, day after day, by a pack of impudent and unlicked cubs of fourteen or so, the males crude enough and the females worse, whose homes did not discipline them, discipline of whom was on principle ignored by the very 'progressive' and in my opinion wholly unrealistic school authorities, and whom I was forbidden by law in any way myself to punish. Life is too short and self-respect is too strong for me to go on."

I told this to a teacher in a school in the Bronx, one of the best esteemed teachers in the New York City school system. "Of course," she said. "Your acquaintance is quite right about it. The same thing is true in New York City. A woman must have the hide of a

rhinoceros to teach in the public schools in our metropolis. It is a rare day that I am not insulted by some of the little beasts, cursed at, shoved and jostled, called a vile name or two. If I let myself notice, I should have to follow your friend's example. I have learned to ignore it."

In parts of the country that are more civilized than the monster cities, in smaller communities where the home has not collapsed, in places where administrators try to deal with real children instead of with the little angels imagined by a good many professors of education, teachers are not quite so trampled on by their charges; but, speaking generally, "the teacher's lot is not a happy one," and gentlemen and gentlewomen think twice before they contemplate teaching and often do not think twice about abandoning it later on for other vocations.

Coupled with this resentment against undiscipline, teachers often feel an irritation at being ordered about by theorists from schools of education who are put into posts of authority over them and who, though they have had small teaching experience themselves, continually want to change procedures to fit in with new ideas thought up in a study somewhere. Teachers think that before pedagogic changes are made, particularly changes which involve radical adjustment of philosophical approach, they who do the instructing should be consulted and persuaded and convinced of the necessity and wisdom thereof; that reforms should come not from the top down but from the bottom up.

They are weary of change and rechange. They see their pupils regarded not as growing human beings but as guinea pigs for experimentation and themselves as unwilling laboratory technicians. Inner revolt drives thousands out of teaching every year and prevents other thousands from preparing for it, and these frequently the cream of the crop. Most teachers realize the facts of the case, but it is usually considered impolitic to say anything about them in public unless one first gets out of teaching. This curious silence is good evidence of "the sickness that destroyeth in the noonday."

To sum up, if we wish teachers in proper numbers and of the right sort, we should:

a. Pay them from twenty-five hundred to six thousand dollars a year and give them assurance of tenure unless incompetence can be proved, and proper pensions on retirement after service.

b. Raise the academic requirements for teachers as rapidly as possible so that teaching becomes a reputable profession. If pedagogues are paid a living wage, the public may thus be made at least a little more sure that it gets its money's worth.*

* How fast should standards be raised? At least this much: that by 1955 it will be true that no one will be licensed to teach, in any school in the land, who has not had two years' general education beyond the high school plus one year's training in the theory and practice of education; that by 1960 no one will be licensed to teach in any school who has not had three years of general education beyond the high school plus one full year in professional subjects, that by 1960 no one will be licensed to teach in a secondary school who has not the master-of-arts degree, with at least one of the five years beyond the high school that are required for that de-

c. Subsidize secondary-school and college students who show potential competence for teaching so that they may prepare themselves for it. Give them if they have need an annual allowance of at least a thousand dollars from the public funds, to be used toward tuition and support in reputable places of training, with a requirement that if they do not enter the profession or leave it voluntarily after less than five years' service they shall pay back all sums advanced to them at the rate of \$200 a year.*

d. Require that no one be given supervisory authority over teachers who has had less than five years of actual teaching experience.

e. Restore to the schools a discipline sufficiently effective to protect teachers from insult and intimidation at the hands of their pupils.

Other things are doubtless necessary for getting and holding competent instructors in sufficient numbers; but the steps just mentioned would seem almost indispensable.

VI

We need to combat the notion that the only attitude toward God which is legitimate in a tax-supported school is the attitude that ignores God as though He

gree devoted to a study of pedagogy. These would seem to be an almost irreducible minimum of requirement, that is if we are to stop playing around with education in the United States

* It is far better to subsidize normal students than to subsidize normal schools. Subsidized schools are subject to political pressures; subsidized students are not so easily pliable.

does not exist or, if He does exist, does not matter.

It is of course proper that atheists should be able to send their children to atheistic schools if they so desire; but it is hard to see why atheists, few in number as they are, should be allowed to force atheistic-by-negation education on the children of the great majority of us who do pay at least theoretical attention to the Deity. As the American school system is now conducted, more and more conducted, there is no such thing as religious liberty in American education. There is liberty only to be unreligious. "In God we trust" we still put on our coins; we cannot entrust our children to Him. If the public schools must "leave religion out," then the only decent thing is to permit religious groups to run their own schools, which of course we now do, and to give them tax money to run them with, which we do not.* Such a step would

* 1 "Let no one say that in a nation where there are different religious beliefs it is impossible for public instruction otherwise than by neutral or mixed schools. In such a case it becomes the duty of the State, indeed it is the easier and more reasonable method of procedure, to leave free scope to the initiative of the Church and the Family, while giving them such assistance as justice demands." So wrote Pope Pius XI in 1929 in the encyclical on *The Education of Christian Youth*. I am not a Roman Catholic, but I do not see how this statement can be refuted except by an appeal to prejudice. What the Pope here says applies to all sorts of private schools. The State has the right, the duty, to see to it that they are pedagogically up to standard, if they are, they should be supported on the same per capita basis as those run by the State itself.

2. The Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops from all over the world, which met in London in July-August 1948, made perfectly plain in its Resolution 29 what one non-Roman Church with 35,000,000 members feels about parochial schools: "The Conference, while giving full support to state education, is convinced that there is a unique value for the community in the long tradition of church education. The Confer-

not in the least violate the principle, embodied in the Constitution, that there must be no established Church in the United States. No one wishes to set up an exclusive *ecclesia*. Those who think that to give public funds to a religious body for schools in which religion matters is somehow tied up with reuniting Church and State, would seem to be just plain ignorant and illogical people, and this whether they sit on cracker barrels or on the Supreme Court of the United States.

If it be contended that multiple school systems divide the body politic, which to some extent they do, then in reply it may be pointed out that the only way to retain complete unity and at the same time give

ence believes that the freedom of experiment which this tradition affords and the religious, moral, and social training which is its specific purpose are invaluable for the best interests of education and that everything possible should be done to open the benefits of such church education to all who desire them." (*The Lambeth Conference 1948*, London, S.P.C.K., p. 33)

§ "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments of this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State, those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations." These were the words of the Supreme Court of the United States in decision of the "Oregon Case," in which the Court nullified, in 1922, a law passed by the state of Oregon which required that every child go to public school and so abolished all private schools. But, it may be asked, if only the public schools are state-supported, if to send children to a school not state-run is possible only at an extra cost beyond the means of most citizens, is the usual parent not in effect coerced to accept the public school even against his conscience? Where is the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution? It would seem to be liberty almost impossible for the poor and reserved for the financially better off.

freedom to those who desire that their children shall recognize God is to see to it that time is given in the public schools to a common examination by the growing children of what are the basic religious and moral ideas, all this taught objectively and with no desire to bring about conviction (which is the province of the Church and the home), and also to furnish opportunity in school hours for the various current faiths in a community to teach their own children what they themselves believe. But this is unlawful according to the Supreme Court (Scopes case, 1948). Is the price of national unity, then, the abandonment of all religion? This is the nub of the matter.*

VII

The schools should refuse to assume burdens properly parental; they have quite enough to do without that. If the American parent is incompetent to look after the physical, social, and ethical upbringing of his or her children, which is certainly true of many parents, possibly true of most of them, then those who have the national welfare at heart, instead of piling impossible burdens on the schools, had better make homemaking and home education itself a basic part

* A very fine treatment, almost indispensable, of this whole matter of religion in the public schools is J Paul Williams, *The New Education and Religion: A Challenge to Secularism in Education*, Association Press, New York, 1945. This book traces the history back of our present absurd but portentous situation and examines, penetratingly and informedly, every suggestion that has been made or is now being made to deal with it. It was of course written before the 1948 decision of the Supreme Court above referred to.

of schooling from six years of age onward and had better go in dead earnest at the education of parents who already are parents.

VIII

Adult education generally is grossly neglected among us, though happily less so with each passing year. The time never comes when a human being can justly be called an "educated person." The world is not divided into the educated and the uneducated, but rather into the educable and the uneducable. If a man were really to come to the place that he was educated, that is to say if he were to come to the end of growing apprehension and understanding, all that could rightly be done to that man would be to dig a hole and bury him. Fortunately few reach such a sad estate. The educable process should be made available for men and women of all ages from babyhood to death.

Nor should it be regarded as enough to assist adults to improve their technical skills and so increase their incomes. There is real hunger for general knowledge, liberal knowledge, among adult persons: witness the introduction of courses in political theory for farmers in Kansas, under the joint direction of the Farm Bureau and the Institute of Citizenship at Kansas State College; witness the great success of the Peoples' High Schools in Denmark,* which do *not* teach technology but devote themselves to the teaching of his-

* These are described by Sir Richard Livingstone in *The Future in Education*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1941; republished in his

tory, bases of Danish culture, the literature of the country, the principles of political and social organization, which admit no pupil under eighteen years of age and none who is not engaged in industry or agriculture; witness the wide spread of the "Great-books Movement"; witness the growth of lecture courses, women's clubs, town halls. There are many things which cannot be studied to much advantage or otherwise than in an atmosphere of artificiality except by people who are grown-up and at work: political science, for instance, or how to handle loneliness and frustration. A community ought to be thoroughly ashamed of itself which does not devote as much thought, time, money, to the education of adults over twenty as it provides for the nurture of children under twenty.

IX

Thought needs to be given to what may be done in respect to teaching morals and manners.

The chief difficulty here is that our American civilization has no agreed-upon ethical standards, standards which can be assumed and taught to the oncoming generation as a matter of course. We are a people with no common world view, no generally accepted definition of the nature and purpose of man.

On Education, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1944 Livingstone's writings about education should be read by everyone who is concerned with what may be taught adults.

Such being the case, it becomes a necessity for each school or college to determine the sort of moral theory to which it intends to commit itself, together with the brand of good manners which it will derive from that theory. If this is not done, the result will be the turning out of amoral graduates and unmannered boors. The ethical commitment of a college or school should be made clear to those who teach, to those who learn, to those to whom appeal is made for pupils and support.

But to whom or to what is a man responsible for his behavior? Only to himself? In spite of the dictum of Polonius, to be true to oneself does not necessarily result in being false to no other man, not unless the self to which one is true is a self devoted to more than self. Otherwise, for people to be true each to himself or herself is more apt to result in anarchy than in an ordered way of life. Is one to be responsible, for what one is and does, only to the will of majorities? This results in a conformist mediocrity. Is one to look to the total social group for standards of behavior, for sanctions? The end of this is a totalitarian setup manipulated by the ruthless and unscrupulous, a negation of just opportunity for freedom of expression and for voluntary self-investment. Is man's responsibility to mere tradition? This is deadly to creative and critical thinking, without which no society can long survive. Is it to negation of tradition? This way lies a deal of precious nonsense and preciousness. Is human responsibility to that which is beyond man? *If so,*

religion is involved, primarily involved, inescapably involved in education.

We need a deeply concerned consideration of the basis of right conduct and decent manners, a consideration carried on not merely on the level of high philosophy but also on the pedagogic level of how to train for character and social cooperation. We need this immediately, demandingly; but our professors of education, our administrators, our teachers, are usually little concerned with inquiry about purpose—purpose in politics, purpose in labor, purpose in living, purpose in anything, including purpose in education itself. This neglect is almost too absurd to be imagined; yet it is a fact. It is obviously ridiculous to try to develop growing human beings without asking what man is to aim at and why. *We might well have a moratorium on discussion of methods and organization of education until we come to some decision about the moral ends of education.*

Ideally decision about such matters should be reached by society as a whole and govern our education as a matter of course; but in a confused state of social disruption like ours in this midtwentieth century, general agreement about morals is next to impossible. In this lies national peril; we have no agreed-upon ethical ideology; there is nothing commonly held as imperative to be promoted or defended, nothing which compels the glad devotion of lives and fortunes unless we get returns in profits and praise. It will be a long time, possibly a fatally long time, before

we again have a national morality unless it be a totalitarian and secularistic morality, which God forbid. Meanwhile each school or college or university is forced to define its own concept of the good life and then strive to impart it, unless that school or college or university is content, as most are in the United States today, to deal only with secondary matters while the commonwealth drifts toward dissolution. We might at least be informing our students about what the various ethical alternatives are. *Make moral philosophy once more the central consideration in education.* Of all the steps suggested or implied for the salvation of teaching and learning, in this book or in any other book on the subject that I have read, this is both the most immediately required and the most difficult.

Would the taking of the nine steps which have just been mentioned serve to rescue American thinking and action from incompetence, insure maturity among us, enable us to avoid alternations of ignorant conceit and of a panic fear, make out of education in America what it reasonably ought to be? Obviously not; but they would help a little, more than a little. In excuse for their obvious inadequacy as a program of reform, let it be remembered again that it is the purpose of this book not to prescribe but to diagnose; perhaps to get the patient, which is all of us, to know that in respect to our pedagogics we are a sick folk, that we have been too long fooled by doctrinaire peda-

gogues who ignore man as he is and children as they are. In short it is our thesis that education in these United States is in crisis, that it is being judged by the relentless impact of reality, that it is being judged and found wanting. Once we realize this, we shall soon have both wisdom and bravery to set about a radical and comprehensive reform.

Index

A

- Abolition of Man, The*, by C. S. Lewis, 166
- Academic freedom, endangered not by the Church but by the State, 191
- Adams family, liberal education of, 26
- Ade, George, 12
- Administration of Religion in Universities and Colleges, The*, by Edward W. Blakeman, 153*n*.
- Adult education, 225-226
- Advisory Committee on Education, its report to F. D. Roosevelt in 1938, 195*n*
- Aldrich Family, The*, 13-24
- American Bai Association, 199
- American Educational System, The*, by J. D. Russell and C. H. Judd, 50*n*., 54*n*., 79*n*., 197*n*., 216*n*
- American Medical Association, 199
- Atlantic Charter, 29

B

- Berdyayev, Nicholas A., 28
- Bertocci, Peter A., 117*n*.

- Birth control and home education, 96-98
- Blakeman, Edward W., 153*n*.
- Bode, Boyd H., 8*n*.
- Brubacher, John S., 8*n*.
- Butler, Nicholas Murray, 191*n*.

C

- Chase, Harry Woodburn, 194*n*.
- Chesterton, Gilbert K., 7
- Chicago, University of (*see* University of Chicago)
- Christianity in an Age of Power*, by Virgil Hancher, 94
- C.I.O., 199
- Class controls of the State, their corruption of education, 184-189
- College*, by J. P. Gavitt, 65*n*.
- College Reading and Religion*, edited by D. P. Cottrell, 117*n*., 118*n*.
- College Seeks Religion, The*, by Merrimon Cuninggim, 152*n*.
- Columbia University, 36, 95, 194*n*.
- Common Man, education of children of, 25-35
- Condition of Man, The*, by Lewis Mumford, 5*n*.

Conformist higher education,
158
Craftsmanship, training in, 34-
35
Cuninggim, Merrimon, 152*n*.

D

Danish Peoples' High Schools,
225
Day, Clarence, Jr., 96
Dewey, John, 8
Discipline in schools, lack of, as
a deterrent to getting and
holding teachers, 218-219
Dunne, Finley Peter, 12

E

Education of Christian Youth,
The, by Pope Pius IX,
222*n*.
Education for Freedom, by
Robert Maynard Hutchins,
189*n*.
Eliot, Charles W., 90
Eliot, T. S., 138
Ely, R. T., 65*n*.
Ends, possible, in education,
16-23
Ethical studies, primary place
of, in sound higher educa-
tion, 58-60, 161-162
Experience, creative, 105
inattention to, lack of bal-
ance resulting from, 113-
117
naturalistic, 102-104
overemphasis on, in Middle
Ages, 109
religious, slighting of, by
Greeks, 108

232

Experience, religious, slighting
of, by Romans, 109, 110
religiously mystical, 105-107
scientific, 104, 105
socially mystical, 105-107
varieties of, 101

F

Farm Bureau and Institute of
Citizenship, Kansas State
College, 225
Federal aid to education, dan-
gers of, to academic free-
dom, 191, 196-198
inevitability of, 191-198
possible solutions to problem
of, 203-205
tendency of, to make propa-
ganda agencies of schools,
204
Federal Department of Educa-
tion, need for, 199
Financial aid to students, Brit-
ish arrangements for, 210-
212
determining who should re-
ceive, 214-215
inadvisability of "aid through
work," 213
more than free tuition
needed in, 212
Future in Education, The, by
Sir Richard Livingstone,
225*n*.

G

GI Bill of Rights, 3-5, 7
Gilley, John, essay on, by
Charles W. Eliot, 89-91

God-men and beast-men, 165-167
 Goldsmith, Clifford, 13-14
 Graduate schools, increasing immaturity of students in, 36-37
 "Great Books Movement," 226
 Greeks, education among, 107-108
Ground Under Our Feet, by R. T. Ely, 65*n.*
 Guinea pigs, treating of pupils as, 220

H

Hancher, Virgil, 94
 Harper, William Rainey, 57-58
 Harris, Seymour E., 192*n.*, 193, 195*n.*, 214*n.*
 "Harvard Plan," the, 76, 189*n.*
 High school, lack of liberal or vocational training in, 68-70
 High schools, a curriculum for, 40-48
 weakness of, 48-55
 Higher education, poor preparation of American students for, 68-70
Higher Education for American Democracy, report of President Truman's Commission, 6
History of the Problems of Education, by John S. Brubacher, 8*n.*
 Hitler, Adolf, 29
 Home, and birth control, 96-98
 failure to function, reasons for, 85-98

Home, failure to perform its education duties, 78-83
 and housing, 86-89
 and the motor car, 94, 95
 and the movies, 93
 and the radio, 94
 and religious education, 137-147
 shared fun in, educative value of, 91-93
 shared labor in, educative value of, 89-91
 teaching of manners, morals, and religion in, 83, 84
 Home education, parental selfishness and, 96-99
How Shall We Pay for Education?, by Seymour E. Harris, 192*n.*, 193, 195*n.*, 214*n.*
 Hutchins, Robert Maynard, 6*n.*, 59*n.*, 100*n.*, 189*n.*

I

Intelligence, 66, 67
 definition of, 60, 61
 inconvenience and unpopularity of, 61, 62
 three-fold discipline for maturity in, 70, 71
 Irreligion, a result of the public school system, 137

J

Jefferson, Thomas, liberal education of, 26
 Jesuits, educational theory and methods of, 8
Johnnycake Papers, 12

Judd, Charles H., 50n., 54n.,
79n., 197n., 216n.

K

*Knickerbocker's History of
New York*, by Washington
Irving, 12

Knowledge, a rational diges-
tion of experience, 101

L

Lambeth Conference of 1948,
222n.

Leadership, function of higher
education to discover and
train for, 59-66
necessity of, for social stabil-
ity, 62-64

Lewis, C. S., 166

Liberal arts, definition of, 70,
71

Lincoln, Abraham, liberal edu-
cation of, 26

Livingstone, Sir Richard, 58,
59, 225n.

Lowell, James Russell, 12

Lower schools, prerequisite for
reform in, 31-35

Lutheran education, 76

M

Man Can Live, A, by Bernard
Iddings Bell, 127n.

Manners, lack of, shown by
pupils to teachers, 218, 219
must be taught chiefly in the
home, 83, 84
necessity for training in, 33

234

Martin, Oliver, 59n., 189n.

Mass-minded education, 157

Mathematics, study of, 68

McGuffey's Readers, 7

Mencken, H. L., 187

*Mental Health through Educa-
tion*, by W. C. Ryan, 118n.

Middle Ages, education in,
110-112

"Mister Dooley," 12

Modern world, education in,
114-126

Morals, considered unreason-
able by children if disci-
pline is involved, 140

and manners, 226-229

must be taught in the home,
83, 84

results of teaching without
religion, 139

Motion pictures, effect of, on
home education, 93

Motor car, effect of, on home
education, 94, 95

Mumford, Lewis, 5n.

Mussolini, Benito, 29

N

National Education Associa-
tion, possible use of, to re-
sist government control of
education, 204

*New Education and Religion,
The*, by J. Paul Williams,
224n.

Nock, Albert Jay, 12, 186

Nock, Samuel Albert, 33n.

Number of pupils to a teacher,
necessary limitation there-
of, 215

O

- Obligations of Universities to the Changing World, The*, by N. M. Butler, 191n.
Oppenheimer, Franz, 186
Ortega y Gasset, 28
Our Enemy the State, by Albert Jay Nock, 187n.

P

- Parent-Teacher Associations, 78, 79
Parental responsibility in education, 81-99
Parents, education of, 224, 225
Parochial schools, 192, 221-224
Lambeth Conference of 1948 on, 222n.
and the "Oregon Case," 224
Pope Pius IX quoted on, 222n
and the "Scopeds Case," 224
Patriotism, true and false, 179-185
Personality and the Family, by Hornell and Hart, 141n.
Pope Pius IX, 222n.
President's (Truman's) Commission on Higher Education 1948, 6, 195n.
Progressive education, 8-11
Promotion without regard to achievement, 34

R

- Radio, effect of, on home education, 94
Religion, best opportunity for study of, as found in the saints, 118-121
definition of, 127, 128

- Religion, must be taught in the home, 83, 84
necessity for education in, 34, 35
necessity of, to mature intelligence, 72
neglect of, results from, 113-117
in university graduates, 163-168
unsectarian instruction in, possible in universities, 168, 169
suggested course for, 170-173
stages in development of, 128-130
bearing of, on education, 130-137
Religion in the Making, by A. N. Whitehead, 128n.
"Religious Emphasis Week," a dodging of issues, 148-161, 177
Renaissance, education in, 112, 113
Revolt of the Masses, The, by Ortega y Gasset, 28n.
Revolution, effect of, on education, 63, 64
Roman Catholic education, 8, 76, 161
Romans, education among, 109, 110
Russell, John Dale, 50n., 54n., 79n., 197n., 216n.
Ryan, W. C., 118n.

S

- St. John's Collegc, Annapolis, Maryland, 76

Science, danger in overreliance
 on, 116, 117
 definition of, 114, 115
 modern, beneficial results of,
 115-117
 misrepresentation of, by
 hangers-on, 122, 123
 need for cooperation of, with
 religion, 124, 125
 overemphasis on, in modern
 education, 114-126
 "Scientific" pedagogy, 8
 Secondary schools (*see* High
 schools)
 Shared fun, educative value of,
 in home education, 91-93
 Shared labor, educative value
 of, in home education, 89-
 91
 Shedd, Clarence P., 153*n*.
Slavery and Freedom, by
 N. A. Berdyaev, 28*n*.
 Stalin, Josef, 29
 State, desire of, to control edu-
 cation, 188-190
 stifling of academic freedom
 by, 190, 191
 use of, as racketeering device,
 186, 187
 Sunday schools, small merits of
 most, 140
 Supreme Court of the United
 States, 224

T

Tarkington, Booth, 12
 Taylor, Bert Leston, 12
 Teachers, better pay needed
 for, 216
 larger share in determining
 policies and methods
 needed by, 219

Teachers, more respect needed
 from pupils for, 218
 more secure tenure for, 217
 need for more and better
 trained, 215, 216
This Simian World, by Clar-
 ence Day, 96
 Thompson, Dorothy, 216*n*.
 "Thoughts after Lambeth," by
 T. S. Eliot, 138*n*.
 Time, waste of, a proposed re-
 organization of American
 education to prevent, 205-
 209
 Total education, inability of
 the school to provide, 78-
 81
 Totalitarian stateism, origin of,
 in expediential morals,
 138
 Tradition, need for knowledge
 of in education, 31, 32
 need for teaching of, 64
*Two Educators: Hutchins and
 Conant*, by Oliver Martin,
 59*n*.
 Twain, Mark, 12
 Tyler, Ralph W., 215

U

United Nations, 29
 United States Coast Guard
 Academy, New London,
 Connecticut, religion at,
 153*n*.
 University of Chicago, 57, 58
 efforts of, to mature intelli-
 gence, 75, 76
 radical rearrangement of the
 academic ladder by, and
 an estimate of the "Col-
 lege" of, 209*n*.

V

Vocational education and liberal education, 49-53

W

Ward, Artemus, 12, 72

Washington, George, nature of patriotism of, 180-183

White, William Allen, 65*n*.

Whitehead, Alfred North, 128

Williams, J. Paul, 224*n*.

Woodbridge, Frederick J. E., 36

Word, number, form, proficiency needed in disciplines of, 32, 33

Y

Yale College, faculty report of, in 1829, 72-74

